arXiv:math/0409434v2 [math.DG] 23 Feb 2008

GEOMETRY AND ANALYSIS OF SPIN EQUATIONS

HUIJUN FAN, TYLER J. JARVIS, AND YONGBIN RUAN

ABSTRACT. We introduce W-spin structures on a Riemann surface Σ and give a precise definition to the corresponding W-spin equations for any quasi-homogeneous polynomial W. Then, we construct examples of nonzero solutions of spin equations in the presence of Ramond marked points. The main result of the paper is a compactness theorem for the moduli space of the solutions of W-spin equations when $W = W(x_1, \dots, x_t)$ is a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with fractional degrees (or weights) $q_i < 1/2$ for all i. In particular, the compactness theorem holds for the superpotentials E_6, E_7, E_8, or A_{n-1}, D_{n+1} for $n \geq 3$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Spin structures on orbicurves and spin equations 4
W-spin structures on smooth orbicurves 5
W-spin equations 7
3. Key examples 9
4. The $\bar\partial$ operator in Weighted Sobolev Spaces 10
4.1. Lockhart-Mcowen theory 10
4.2. Fredholm theory for $\bar\partial$ operator 13
5. Inner compactness of the solution spaces of W-spin equations 18
6. Compactifying the solution space of the W-spin equation 28
Acknowledgments 34
References 34

1. INTRODUCTION

Since Donaldson's remarkable work in the 1980's regarding anti-self dual equations on 4-manifolds, the study of the solution space (moduli space) of a nonlinear elliptic PDE has attracted a great deal of attention in geometry and topology. For example, the famous Donaldson invariants, Seiberg-Witten invariants and Gromov-Witten invariants were constructed out of the moduli space of anti-self dual Yang-Mill's equations, the Seiberg-Witten equations, and the $\bar\partial$ equation, respectively. These invariants have revolutionized many subjects of mathematics. There is a well-known program originated by Donaldson and Taubes to construct invariants out of an elliptic equation. The first, and often most important, step is to study the analytic properties of equations such as compactness and

---

The first author was partially supported by the Research Fund for returned overseas Chinese Scholars 20010107 and the Partner Group of the Max-Planck Institute for mathematics in the sciences and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and later by NSFC 10401001, NSFC 10321001 and NSFC 10631050. The second author was partially funded by NSF Grant DMS0105788. The third author was partially supported by an NSF grant and a Hong Kong RGC grant.

Fredholm theory. Once the elliptic equation under study possesses nice analytic properties, we can apply sophisticated machinery to extract topological invariants. It is often a difficult problem to show that an elliptic equation has "nice" analytic properties. In terms of the analytic framework, the best understood ones are conformally invariant first order equations such as the anti-self dual equation on a 4-manifold and the $\bar{\partial}$-equation in two dimensions. One can understand these two types of equations through Uhlenbeck's bubbling analysis. Beyond conformally invariant equations, there is not yet a standard framework. In this paper, we study a new type of elliptic equation (spin equation) on Riemann surfaces introduced by Witten. A spin equation is of the form

$$\bar{\partial} u_i + \overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}} = 0,$$

where W is a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, and u_i is interpreted as the section of an appropriate orbifold line bundle on a Riemann surface Σ. Typically, a spin equation is not conformally invariant.

The simplest spin equation (A_{r-1} case) is of the form

$$\bar{\partial} u + r\bar{u}^{r-1} = 0.$$

It was introduced by Witten [24] more than ten years ago as a generalization of topological gravity. Somehow, it was buried in the literature without attracting much attention. Recently, Witten generalized it to a spin equation for an arbitrary quasi-homogeneous polynomial [25] and coined it the "Landau-Ginzburg A-model." There appears to be a mirror symmetry between this theory and usual Landau-Ginzburg theory (B-model) [12, 13]. The construction of invariants and the application to mirror symmetry will be left to a separate article. We will focus on the analytic aspect of the theory.

We begin with a brief history of the motivation behind the spin equation. Around 1990, Witten proposed a remarkable conjecture relating the intersection number of the Deligne-Mumford moduli space of stable curves with the KdV integrable hierarchy [23]. His conjecture was soon proved by Kontsevich [14]. About the same time, Witten also proposed a generalization of his conjecture. In his generalization, the stable curve is replaced by a certain root of the canonical bundle (spin-curve) and the KdV-hierarchy was replaced by certain, more general, KP-hierarchies called nKdV, or Gelfand-Dikii, hierarchies. Since then, the moduli space of spin-curves has been rigorously constructed by the second author and his collaborators [1, 9, 10, 11].

An important phenomenon in the theory of spin curves is the appearance of Neveu-Schwarz and Ramond marked points. Recall that u_i is the section of a certain orbifold line bundle L_i. Assume that all the orbifold points are marked points. A marked point with trivial orbifold structure is called a Ramond marked point, and otherwise it is called a Neveu-Schwarz marked point. Contrary to intuition, Ramond marked points are much harder to study than Neveu-Schwarz marked points. If there is no Ramond marked point, a simple lemma of Witten's shows that the spin equation has only the zero solution. Therefore, our moduli problem becomes an algebraic geometry problem. In fact, Witten conjectured that the contribution of a Ramond marked point to the corresponding field theory is zero in the A_{r-1} case (the decoupling of the Ramond sector). This was proved true for genus zero in [11] and for higher genus in [19]. This is partly why the moduli space of spin curves has been around for a long time while the spin equation seems to have been lost in the literature. In the course of our investigation, we discovered that in the D_n-case the Ramond sector gives a nonzero contribution. Hence, we have to develop a theory to account for the contribution of the solution of the spin equation in the presence of Ramond marked points.

The situation would be relatively simple if one could show that the solution has to be zero as in the case of pure Neveu-Schwarz marked points. Unfortunately, this is not the case, as we were able to construct a nonzero solution of the spin equation. Therefore, we have no choice but to develop a full moduli theory of spin equations with Ramond marked points. This is the first of a series of articles to accomplish that task.

Define $\mathscr{M}_r(\Sigma, W)$ to be the space of regular solutions $(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ of the W-spin equations on Σ, and let $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ be the solution space of W-spin equations which contains both the regular and the singular solutions. Now we can formulate our main theorems as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Inner compactness). *Suppose* $W = W(x_1,\dots,x_t)$ *to be a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with fractional degrees (or weights* $wt(x_i)$*)* $q_i = wt(x_i) \leq 1/2$*. Let* $E(u) := \sum_{z_l:Ramond} \sum_{j:W_j \, is \; Ramond \; at \, z_l} Res_{z_l}(W_j(u_1,\dots,u_t))$ *be the residue map from* $\mathscr{M}_r(\Sigma, W)$ *to* $\mathbb{C}$*. Then*

1. *for any* $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0,\infty)$*, we have* $E^{-1}(a) = \emptyset$*; and*
2. *for any* $a \in [0,\infty)$*,* $E^{-1}([0,a])$ *is a compact space in the* L_1^p *topology for* $2 \leq p < \frac{2}{1-\delta}$*, where* $\delta = \min\{q_1,\dots,q_t\}$*.*

Theorem 1.2 (Weak compactness). *Suppose* $W = W(x_1,\dots,x_t)$ *to be a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with fractional degrees (or weights* $wt(x_i)$*)* $q_i = wt(x_i) < 1/2$*. For any* $\varepsilon > 0$*, let* Σ_ε *be the subset of* Σ *consisting of points which are distance at least* ε *away from Ramond marked points. Then the restriction of* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *to* Σ_ε *is compact in* $L_1^p(\Sigma_\varepsilon)$ *for* $2 \leq p < \frac{2}{1-\delta}$*, where* $\delta = \min\{q_1,\dots,q_t\}$*.*

Theorem 1.3 (Strong compactness). *Suppose* $W = W(x_1,\dots,x_t)$ *to be a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with fractional degrees (or weights* $wt(x_i)$*)* $q_i = wt(x_i) < 1/2$*. Then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* $\underbrace{L^{p_1} \times \cdots \times L^{p_t}}_{t}$ *for* $0 < p_i < 2(1-2q_i)/q_i$*. In particular, we have*

1. *If* W *is the* A_{r-1}*-superpotential, then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* L^p *for* $1 < p < 2(r-2)$*.*
2. *If* W *is the* D_n*-superpotential for* $n \geq 4$*, then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2}$ *for* $1 < p_1 < 2(n-2), 0 < p_2 < 4/(n-1)$*.*
3. *If* W *is the* E_6 *superpotential, then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2}$ *for* $1 < p_1 < 2, 1 < p_2 < 4$*.*
4. *If* W *is the* E_7 *superpotential, then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2}$ *for* $1 < p_1 < 2, 1 < p_2 < 5$*.*
5. *If* W *is the* E_8 *superpotential, then* $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ *is compact with respect to the topology in* $L^{p_1} \times L^{p_2}$ *for* $1 < p_1 < 2, 1 < p_2 < 6$*.*

Remark 1.4. Because of the W-spin structure, $W(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ takes value in the log-canonical bundle, hence we can take the residue at the Ramond marked points. Theorem 1.1 means that a sequence of points $\{u^l = (u_1^l,\dots,u_t^l)\}$ in $\mathscr{M}_r(\Sigma, W)$ loses compactness if and only if $E(u^l) \to +\infty$. The crucial identity connecting the total residue and the natural energy of the sections will be given in Theorem 5.5. Theorem 1.2 means that all the possible blow-up points of a sequence of solutions in $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$ are Ramond marked points. Theorem 1.3 means that we can compactify the space $\mathscr{M}_r(\Sigma, W)$ in some L^p topology so that its closure is just $\mathscr{M}(\Sigma, W)$.

Remark 1.5. Our requirement for the fractional degrees of W is sharp. If the fractional degree $q_i = 1/2$ for some i, then the weak and the strong compactness theorems may not be true. For example, we can consider the A_1-case, where the fractional degree is $1/2$ and the spin equation is

$$\bar{\partial}u + r\bar{u} = 0.$$

This is a real-linear equation: if u is a solution, then λu is also a solution for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 do not hold.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will introduce the W-spin equations and their basic properties. In Section 3, we will present our key example of a nonzero solution of the spin equation in the presence of two Ramond marked points. More importantly, we construct a sequence of regular nonzero solutions converging to a singular one. This indicates the complexity of the problem. In Section 4, we give the L^p estimate of the $\bar{\partial}$ operator in certain natural weighted Sobolev spaces arising in the problem and prove $\bar{\partial}$ is a Fredholm operator under some mild constraints. The core of the paper is in the last two sections, where we establish the three compactness theorems. We will prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 5 and Theorem 1.2–1.3 in Section 6.

2. SPIN STRUCTURES ON ORBICURVES AND SPIN EQUATIONS

In this section, we will introduce W-spin structures on orbicurves, where $W \in \mathbb{C}[x_1,\dots,x_t]$ is a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial. By means of W-spin structures, one can define the W-spin equations on orbicurves.

Let $W \in \mathbb{C}[x_1,\dots,x_t]$ be a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, i.e., there exist degrees $d, k_1,\dots,k_t \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ such that for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$

$$W(\lambda^{k_1}x_1,\dots,\lambda^{k_t}x_t) = \lambda^d W(x_1,\dots,x_t).$$

Definition 2.1. W is called *nondegenerate* if

(1) the fractional degrees $q_i = \frac{k_i}{d}$ are uniquely determined by W; and
(2) the hypersurface defined by W in weighted projective space is non-singular, or equivalently, the affine hypersurface defined by W has an isolated singularity at the origin.

Remark 2.2. Although the first condition does not play an essential role in this paper, it is essential for producing a compact moduli space of orbicurves with spin structure, which is a major part of the motivation for this paper. Thus we will not hesitate to use this assumption whenever it is convenient.

From now on, we always assume the quasi-homogeneous polynomial W is nondegenerate and the corresponding degrees $d, k_1,\dots,k_t$ of W are the *least* positive integer degrees.

Example 2.3.

(1) We call $W(x) = x^r$ the A_{r-1} superpotential. In this case, the variable x has weight $q_x = 1/r$.
(2) We call $W(x,y) = x^n + xy^2$ the D_{n+1} superpotential; it has $q_x = 1/n$ and $q_y = \frac{n-1}{2n}$.
(3) Similarly, we call $W(x,y) = x^3 + y^4, W(x,y) = x^3 + xy^3$, and $W(x,y) = x^3 + y^5$, the E_6, E_7, and E_8 superpotentials, respectively, and their weights are $(q_x,q_y) = (1/3,1/4)$, $(1/3,2/9)$, and $(1/3,1/5)$, respectively.

Lemma 2.4. *If W is non-degenerate, then the group*

$$H := \{(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_t) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^t | W(\alpha_1 x_1,\dots,\alpha_t x_t) = W(x_1,\dots,x_t)\}$$

of diagonal symmetries of W is finite. In particular, we have

$$H \subseteq \mu_{d/k_1} \times \cdots \times \mu_{d/k_t} \cong k_1\mathbb{Z}/d \times \cdots \times k_t\mathbb{Z}/d,$$

where μ_l is the group of lth roots of unity.

Proof. First write $W = \sum_{j=1}^{s} W_j$ with $W_j = c_j \prod x_l^{b_{l,j}}$ and with $c_j \neq 0$. The uniqueness of the fractional degrees is equivalent to saying that the matrix $B = (b_{l,j})$ has rank t. We may as well assume that B is invertible. Now write $h = (h_1, \dots, h_t) \in H$, as $h_j = exp(u_j + v_j i)$ for $u_j \in \mathbb{R}$ is uniquely determined and $v_j \in \mathbb{R}$ is determined up to integral multiple of $2\pi i$. The equations $W(h_1x_1, \dots, h_tx_t) = W(x_1, \dots, x_t)$ can now be written as $B(u+vi) \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi i\mathbb{Z}}$. The invertibility of B shows that $u_l = 0$ for all l—thus H lives in $U(1)^t$, and a straightforward argument shows that the number of solutions $\pmod{2\pi i\mathbb{Z}}$ to the equation $B(vi) \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi i\mathbb{Z}}$ is also finite. □

W-spin structures on smooth orbicurves. Let $(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{m})$ be a smooth orbicurve (or orbifold Riemann surface) as defined in [20, 22], i.e., $(\tilde{\Sigma}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{m})$ is a Riemann surface Σ with marked points $\mathbf{z} = \{z_i\}$ having orbifold structure near each marked point z_i given by a faithful action of $\mathbb{Z}/m_i$. In other words, a neighborhood of each marked point is uniformized by the branched covering map $z \to z^{m_i}$. Let $\rho : \tilde{\Sigma} \to \Sigma$ be the natural projection to the coarse Riemann surface Σ.

A line bundle L on Σ can be uniquely lifted to an orbifold line bundle on $\tilde{\Sigma}$. We denote the lifted bundle by the same L.

Definition 2.5. Let K be the canonical bundle of Σ, and let

$$K_{log} := K \otimes \mathscr{O}(z_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathscr{O}(z_k)$$

be the *log-canonical bundle*, that is to say, the bundle whose holomorphic sections are $1-$forms holomorphic away from the special points $\{Z_i\}$ and with at worst simple poles at the Z_i. K_{log} can be thought of as the canonical bundle of the punctured Riemann surface $\Sigma - \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$. Suppose that $L_1, \dots, L_t$ are orbifold line bundles on $\tilde{\Sigma}$ with isomorphisms $\varphi_j : W_j(L_1, \dots, L_t) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_{\log}$, where by $W_j(L_1, \dots, L_t)$ we mean the jth monomial of W in L_i,

$$W_j(L_1, \dots, L_t) = L_1^{\otimes b_{1j}} \otimes \dots, \otimes L_t^{\otimes b_{tj}},$$

and where K_{log} is identified with its pull-back to $\tilde{\Sigma}$. The tuple $(L_1, \dots, L_t, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_s)$ is called a *W-spin structure*.

Definition 2.6. Suppose that the chart of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ at an orbifold point z_i is $D/(\mathbb{Z}/m)$ with action $e^{\frac{2\pi i}{m}}(z) = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{m}}z$. Suppose that the local trivialization of an orbifold line bundle L is $(D \times \mathbb{C})/(\mathbb{Z}/m)$ with the action

$$e^{\frac{2\pi i}{m}}(z, w) = (e^{\frac{2\pi i}{m}}z, e^{\frac{2\pi i v}{m}}w). \tag{1}$$

When $v = 0$, we say that L is *Ramond* at z_i. When $v > 0$, we say L is *Neveu-Schwarz (NS)* at z_i.

A W-spin structure $(L_1, \dots, L_t, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_s)$ is called *Ramond* at the point z_i if the group element $h = (\exp(2\pi i v_1/m), \dots, \exp(2\pi i v_t/m))$ defined by the orbifold action on the line bundles L_k at z_i acts trivially on all the line bundles occurring in the monomial W_j. In other words, the W-spin structure is Ramond if there is a monomial $W_j = c_j \prod x_l^{be,j}$ in W such that for every l with $b_{l,j} > 0$ the line bundle L_l is Ramond at z_i.

Remark 2.7. If L is an orbifold line bundle on a smooth orbifold Riemann surface $\tilde{\Sigma}$, then the sheaf of locally invariant holomorphic sections of L is locally free of rank one, and hence dual to a unique orbifold line bundle $|L|$ on Σ. We also denote $|L|$ by $\rho_* L$, and it corresponds to the desingularization of L [4](Prop 4.2.1). It can be constructed as follows.

We keep the local trivialization at other places and change it at the orbifold point z_i by a $\mathbb{Z}/m$-equivariant map $\Psi : (D-\{0\})\times\mathbb{C} \to (D-\{0\})\times\mathbb{C}$ by

$$(z,w) \to (z^m, z^{-v}w), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}/m$ acts trivially on the second $(D-\{0\})\times\mathbb{C}$. Then, we extend $L|_{((D-\{0\})\times\mathbb{C})}$ to a smooth holomorphic line bundle over Σ by the second trivialization. Since $\mathbb{Z}/m$ acts trivially, this gives a line bundle over Σ, which is $|L|$. Note that if L is Ramond at z_i, then $|L| = L$ locally. When L is Neveu-Schwarz at z_i, then $|L|$ will differ from L.

Example 2.8. A smooth orbifold Riemann surface $\tilde{\Sigma} = (\Sigma, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{m})$ has a natural orbifold canonical bundle $K_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$, namely its (orbifold) cotangent bundle. The desingularization is related to the canonical bundle of Σ by

$$|K_{\tilde{\Sigma}}| = K_\Sigma \otimes_i \mathscr{O}(-(m_i-1)z_i).$$

On the other hand, the desingularization of the log-canonical bundle of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is again the log-canonical bundle of Σ, since K_{log} is Ramond at every marked point (the orbifold action on dz and on z is the same, so it is trivial on dz/z).

Next we study the sections. Suppose that s is a section of $|L|$ having local representative $g(u)$. Then, $(z, z^v g(z^m))$ is a local section of L. Therefore, we obtain a section $\rho^*(s) \in \Omega^0(L)$ which equals s away from orbifold points, under the identification given by Equation 2. It is clear that if s is holomorphic, so is $\rho^*(s)$. If we start from an analytic section of L, we can reverse the above process to obtain a section of $|L|$. In particular, L and $|L|$ have isomorphic spaces of holomorphic sections. In the same way, there is a map $\rho^* : \Omega^{0,1}(|L|) \to \Omega^{0,1}(L)$, where $\Omega^{0,1}(L)$ is the space of orbifold $(0,1)$-forms with values in L. Suppose that $g(u)d\bar{u}$ is a local representative of a section of $t \in \Omega^{0,1}(|L|)$. Then $\rho^*(t)$ has a local representative $z^v g(z^m) m\bar{z}^{m-1} d\bar{z}$. Moreover, ρ^* induces an isomorphism from $H^1(|L|) \to H^1(L)$.

Suppose now that $L^r \cong K_{log}$ with the action of $\mathbb{Z}/m$ on L as in Equation (1). Since K_{log} is Ramond at every marked point, we must have $rv = lm$ for some l. The integer l is non-zero precisely when v is, and thus L is Neveu-Schwarz at z_i if and only if $l > 0$. Moreover, we have $v < m$, so $l < r$, and of course $\frac{v}{m} = \frac{l}{r}$. Suppose that $s \in \Omega^0(|L|)$ with local representative $g(u)$. Then, $\rho^*(s^r)$ has local representative $z^{rv}g^r(z^m) = z^{ml}g^r(z^m) = u^l g^r(u)$. Hence, $s^r \in \Omega^0(K_{log} \otimes \mathscr{O}((-l_i)z_i)$, and thus when $l_i > 0$, or equivalently, when L is Neveu-Schwarz at every z_i, we have $s^r \in \Omega^0(K)$.

Remark 2.9. More generally, if $L^r \cong K_{log}$ on a smooth orbicurve with action of the local group on L defined by l_i (as above) at each marked point, then we have

$$(\rho_* L)^r = |L|^r = K_{log} \otimes \mathscr{O}((-l_i)z_i)$$

locally, near z_i.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $(L_1, \ldots, L_t)$ be a W-spin structure on a smooth orbicurve. Suppose that the local group G_z of z acts on L_j by $exp(2\pi i/m)(z, w_j) = (exp(2\pi i/m)z, exp(2\pi i v_j/m)w_j)$. There is a unique element $h \in H$ such that $exp(2\pi i v_j/m) = h_j = exp(2\pi i a_j(h))$ with $a_j(h) \in [0,1)$ for every j. Moreover, for every monomial W_i, we have*

$$W_i(|L_1|, \ldots, |L_t|) \cong K_{\log} \otimes \mathscr{O}(-\sum_{j=1}^{t} b_{ij} a_j(h) z)$$

near the point z. Letting h_l define the action of the local group G_{z_l} near z_l, we have the global isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} W_i(|L_1|),\dots,|L_t|) &\cong K_{log}\otimes\mathscr{O}(-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{t} b_{ij}a_j(h_l)z_l) \\ &\cong K_\Sigma\otimes\mathscr{O}(-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{t} b_{ij}(a_j(h_l)-q_j)z_l). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of $h\in H$ is a straightforward generalization of the argument for $W=W_{A_{r-1}}$, given above. The rest is an immediate consequence of the description of h as $h=(exp(2\pi ia_1(h),\dots,exp(2\pi ia_t(h))$ and the description of $|L_j|$ in terms of the action of the local group G_z given above. □

W-spin equations. For each monomial W_i, let $D=-\sum_{l=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{t}b_{ij}(a_j(h_l)-q_j)z_l$ be a divisor, then there is a canonical meromorphic section s_0 with divisor D. This section provides the identification

$$K_\Sigma\otimes\mathscr{O}(D)\overset{s_0^{-1}}{\cong}K_\Sigma(D),$$

where $K_\Sigma(D)$ is the sheaf of local, possibly meromorphic, sections of K_Σ with zeros (or poles) determined by D. When at least one of the line bundles occurring in the monomial W_i is Neveu-Schwarz at z_l, then D is not effective. So the local section of $K_\Sigma(D)$ has zeros, and hence is a natural sub-sheaf of K_Σ. In general, however, it is a sub-sheaf of K_{log}. For each marked point, there is a canonical local section $\frac{dz}{z}$ of K_{log}. Using the isomorphism φ_i, there is a local section t_i of L_i with the property $W_i(t_1,\dots,t_k)=\frac{dz}{z}$. The choice of t_i is unique up to the action of H. We choose a metric on K_{log} with the property $|\frac{dz}{z}|=\frac{1}{|z|}$. It induces a unique metric on L_i with property $|t_i|=|z|^{-q_i}$. Using the correspondence between L_i and $|L_i|$, it induces a metric on $|L_i|$ with the behavior $|e_i|=|z|^{a_i(h)-q_i}$ near a marked point, where e_i is the corresponding local section of $|L_i|$. In particular, it is a singular metric at any marked point where L is Ramond.

As before, we assume that $W=\sum W_i=\sum_i(c_i\prod_l x_l^{b_{il}})$. Let $u_j=\tilde{u}_je_j$, then it is easy to see that

$$\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_j}}\in\overline{K}_{log}\otimes\overline{|L_j|}^{-1}. \tag{3}$$

The bundle $\overline{|L_j|}^{-1}$ is isomorphic to $|L_j|$ topologically. But there is no canonical isomorphism. However, we can choose an isomorphism compatible with the metric. It induces an isomorphism $I_1:\Omega(\Sigma,\overline{|L_j|}^{-1}\otimes\Lambda^{0,1})\to\Omega(\Sigma,|L_j|\otimes\Lambda^{0,1})$, such that for a section $v=\tilde{v}e'_j$, we have

$$I_1(\tilde{v}\overline{e'_j}\otimes d\overline{z})=\tilde{v}|e'_j|^2e_j\otimes d\overline{z},$$

where e'_j is the holomorphic basis of $|L_j|^{-1}$ such that $e'_j\cdot e_j=1$.

It is obvious that I_1 is the unique metric-preserving isomorphism between the corresponding two spaces, and it is independent of the choice of the local charts.

Since $I_1(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_j}})\in\overline{K}_{log}\otimes|L_j|$, the W-spin equation is defined below as the first order system of the sections $u_1,\dots,u_t$:

$$\bar{\partial}u_j+I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_j}}\right)=0,\quad \text{for all } j=1,\dots,t.$$

Remark 2.11. The desingularization of the orbifold line bundle L_j induces isomorphisms $\rho_j : \Omega^0(|L_j|) \to \Omega^0(L_j)$ and $\rho_j^* : \Omega^{0,1}(|L_j|) \to \Omega^{0,1}(L_j)$. It is easy to see that ρ^* commutes with $\bar\partial$ and $\frac{\partial \overline{W}}{\partial u_j}$, hence the above W-spin equations can be regarded also as equations defined on the orbicurve. However, we will study the W-spin equations in the resolution line bundle $|L_j|$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that the surface Σ contains k disjoint closed unit disc $B_1(z_l)$ centered at marked points $z_l, l = 1, \cdots, k$. Take a compact set $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma \setminus \cup_{l=1}^k B_{e^{-1}}(z_l)$ such that $\{\Sigma_0, B_1(z_1), \cdots, B_k(z_k)\}$ forms a cover of Σ. Let $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \cdots, \varphi_k$ be the C^∞ partition functions subordinate to the above cover. We define the weighted L^p and L_1^p norms of the section $u_i = \tilde{u}_i e_i$ in $B_1(z_l)$ as:

$$||u_i||_{p;B_1} = \left(\int_{B_1(z_l)} |\tilde{u}_i|^p |e_i|^p |dz d\bar{z}| \right)^{1/p}.$$

$$||u_i||_{1,p;B_1(z_l)} = \left(\int_{B_1(z_l)} (|\tilde{u}_i|^p + |\partial \tilde{u}_i| + |\bar\partial \tilde{u}_i|^p) |e_i|^p |dz d\bar{z}| \right)^{1/p}.$$

On the interior domain Σ_0, the norm $|e_i|$ of the base e_i is not singular, we have the usual definition of Sobolev norm $||u_i||_{W_k^p(\Sigma_0)}$ of u_i.

The global L^p and L_1^p norms are defined as:

$$||u_i||_p = ||\varphi_0 u_i||_{W_0^p(\Sigma_0)} + \sum_{l=1}^k ||\varphi_l u_i||_{p;B_1(z_l)}.$$

$$||u_i||_{1,p} = ||\varphi_0 u_i||_{W_1^p(\Sigma_0)} + \sum_{l=1}^k ||\varphi_l u_i||_{1,p;B_1(z_l)}.$$

The weighted Sobolev space $L_1^p(\Sigma, |L_j|)$ is defined as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Sigma \setminus \{z_1, \cdots, z_k\}, |L_j|)$ under the norm $|| \cdot ||_{1,p}$ and $L^p(\Sigma, |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Sigma \setminus \{z_1, \cdots, z_k\}, |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$ under the norm $|| \cdot ||_p$.

Definition 2.12. Sections $(u_1, \ldots, u_t)$ are said to be *regular* solutions of the W-spin equations

$$\bar\partial u_j + I_1 \left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \tilde{u}_j}} \right) = 0, \tag{4}$$

if, for each j, we have $u_j \in L_1^2(\Sigma, |L_j|)$, and $I_1(\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_j}) \in L^2(\Sigma, |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$, and $(u_1, \ldots, u_t)$ satisfy the W-spin equations almost everywhere.

A regular solution is continuous near a Ramond marked point. Hence, it takes a value at a Ramond marked point, which we call the *residue* of the solution.

The spin equation $\bar\partial u_j + I_1(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_j}}) = 0$ has different properties near the Ramond marked points and Neveu-Schwarz marked points.

Let $u_j = \tilde{u}_j e_j$ be a local expression in a coordinate near a marked point z_l. The W-spin equation becomes

$$\frac{\bar\partial \tilde{u}_i}{\partial \bar{z}} + \sum_j \overline{\frac{\partial W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \ldots, \tilde{u}_t)}{\partial \tilde{u}_i} z^{\Sigma_{s=1}^t b_{js}(a_s(h_l) - q_s)}} |e_i'|^2 = 0. \tag{5}$$

If all the monomials of W are Ramond, then we have

$$\frac{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}{\partial\bar{z}}+\overline{\frac{\partial W(\tilde{u}_1,\dots,\tilde{u}_t)}{\partial\tilde{u}_j}\frac{1}{z}}|e_j'|^2=0. \tag{6}$$

In polar coordinates, this equation can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2}r(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}+\sqrt{-1}\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta})\tilde{u}_j+\overline{\frac{\partial W(\tilde{u}_1,\dots,\tilde{u}_t)}{\partial\tilde{u}_j}}r^{2q_j}=0. \tag{7}$$

3. KEY EXAMPLES

If all the marked points are Neveu-Schwarz, an easy lemma by Witten shows that the spin-equation has only the zero solution. This was the context people worked with on this subject for a long time. It was not clear that in the presence of a Ramond marked point the spin equation still should have only the zero solution. Indeed, for a while this was what people hoped for. In this section, we exhibit examples of infinitely many regular nonzero solutions of the A_{r-1}-spin equation degenerating to a non-regular solution. All the analysis in this paper was designed with this example in mind.

We first start from local solutions of the A_{r-1} spin equation.

Example 3.1 (**A local solution of the A_{r-1}-spin equation near Ramond marked points).** Near a Ramond marked point, Equation (7) becomes

$$\rho\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}+\sqrt{-1}\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\right)\tilde{u}+2r\bar{\tilde{u}}^{r-1}\rho^{\frac{2}{r}}=0.$$

If we assume further that u is a real function and depends only on the radius ρ, then we have

$$\frac{d\tilde{u}}{d\rho}=-2r\tilde{u}^{r-1}\rho^{\frac{2}{r}-1}.$$

Now a special local solution is given by

$$\tilde{u}=(r^2(r-2)\rho^{\frac{2}{r}}+C)^{-\frac{1}{r-2}},$$

where C is a positive constant.

An easy computation shows that $\tilde{u}\in L_1^p$ if and only if $p<\frac{2}{1-\frac{1}{r}}$.

Example 3.2 (**Global solutions).** Let $(\mathbb{CP}^1,3,\mathbf{z})$ be a marked sphere with two Ramond marked points and one Neveu-Schwarz marked point with trivial action $e^{2\pi i}(z,w)=(z,w)$.

We shall construct a sequence of global regular solutions of the A_{r-1}-spin equations.

Let $\mathbb{CP}^1=U_0\cup U_1$, where $U_0=\{[Z_0,Z_1]|Z_0\neq 0\}$. Let $z=\frac{Z_1}{Z_0}$ be the affine coordinate in U_0, so the Fubini-Study metric is given by

$$\omega=\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi}\frac{dz\wedge d\bar{z}}{(1+|z|^2)^2}.$$

So the induced metric on the canonical bundle is given by

$$|dz|=1+|z|^2.$$

In U_0 the A_{r-1}-spin equation is given by

$$\frac{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}_0}{\partial\bar{z}}+\frac{r}{\bar{z}}(1+|z|^2)^{-\frac{2}{r}}|z|^{\frac{2}{r}}\bar{\tilde{u}}_0^{r-1}=0.$$

If we only consider the real-valued solution, then the above equation becomes

$$\frac{d\tilde{u}_0}{d\rho} = -2r\tilde{u}_0^{r-1}\rho^{\frac{2}{r}-1}(1+\rho^2)^{-\frac{2}{r}}.$$

Therefore

$$\tilde{u}_0(\rho) = [2r(r-2)\int_0^\rho \tau^{\frac{2}{r}-1}(1+\tau^2)^{-\frac{2}{r}}d\tau + u_0^{-(r-2)}(0)]^{-\frac{1}{r-2}}.$$

It is easy to check that $u = \tilde{u}_0(\frac{dz}{z})^{\frac{1}{r}}$ is really a global solution of the A_{r-1}-spin equation. Namely if we represent u by $\tilde{u}_1$ in the other local chart U_1, then it also satisfies the A_{r-1}-spin equation. Note that $\tilde{u}_0(z) = \tilde{u}_1(z)(-1)^{\frac{1}{r}}$ in $U_0 \cap U_1$.

One can easily obtain the relation:

$$R = \tilde{u}_1^r(0) + \tilde{u}_0^r(0) = u_0^r(0) - (\int_0^\infty (\frac{\tau}{1+\tau^2})^{\frac{2}{r}}\frac{1}{\tau}d\tau + u_0(0)^{-(r-2)})^{-\frac{r}{r-2}} > 0.$$

Thus, if $R \to \infty$(or $u_0(0) \to \infty$), then

$$\tilde{u}_0(\rho) \to [2r(r-2)\int_0^\rho \tau^{\frac{2}{r}-1}(1+\tau^2)^{-\frac{2}{r}}d\tau]^{-\frac{1}{r-2}},$$

which is not a regular solution of the r-spin equation.

4. THE $\bar{\partial}$ OPERATOR IN WEIGHTED SOBOLEV SPACES

The Fredholm theory of elliptic operators in weighted Sobolev spaces has been discussed by many authors (see [15], [17], [16] and references there). In this section, first we recollect the work of Lockhart and Mcowen for general elliptic operators defined on a noncompact manifolds with finite ends. Then as an application of their work, we list the corresponding Fredholm properties for $\bar{\partial}$, while giving some useful estimates.

4.1. **Lockhart-Mcowen theory.** Suppose X is an n-dimensional noncompact manifold without boundary, containing a compact set X_0 such that

$$X \setminus X_0 = \{(\omega,\tau) : \omega \in \Omega, \tau \in (0,\infty)\},$$

where Ω is a $n-1$-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold with a smooth measure $d\omega$.

Let E, F be rank-d vector bundles over X. Denote by $C^\infty(E)$ the set of smooth sections and $C_0^\infty(E)$ the set of smooth sections with compact set. Choose a finite cover $\{\Omega_1, \cdots, \Omega_N\}$ of coordinate patches of Ω and let $X_\nu = \Omega_\nu \times (0,+\infty)$. We can continue to choose a covering $X_{N+1}, \cdots, X_M$ of coordinate patches of X_0 such that E can be trivialized over $X_\nu, \nu = 1, \cdots, N, \cdots, M$. Let $u = (u_1, \cdots, u_d)$ be a trivialization of a section u with compact support over X_ν, we can define the norm

$$||u||_{W_s^p(X_\nu)} := \sum_{|\alpha|\le s}\sum_{l=1}^{d} ||D^\alpha u_l||_{W_0^p(X_\nu)}, \ \ (D = -i\partial/\partial x)$$

where we use the measure $d\omega d\tau$ if $\nu = 1, \cdots, N$. Let $\varphi_1, \cdots, \varphi_{N+M}$ be a set of C^∞ partition functions subordinate to the cover $X_1, \cdots, X_{N+M}$. We define a norm on $C_0^\infty(E)$ by

$$||u||_{W_s^p} = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N+M} ||\varphi_\nu u||_{W_s^p(X_\nu)}$$

and let $W_s^p(E)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(E)$ in this norm. We can add a weight at infinity to generalize this space. Over $X_\nu, \nu = 1, \cdots, N$ we define the weighted norm

$$||u||_{W^p_{s,\kappa}(X_\nu)} := \sum_{|\alpha|\leq s} \sum_{l=1}^{d} ||e^{\kappa\tau} D^\alpha u_l||_{W_0^p(X_\nu)}$$

and replace $W_s^p(E)$ by $W^p_{s,\kappa}(E)$ whose norm is given below

$$||u||_{W^p_{s,\kappa}} = \sum_{\nu=N+1}^{N+M} ||\varphi_\nu u||_{W_s^p(X_\nu)} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} ||\varphi_\nu u||_{W^p_{s,\kappa}(X_\nu)}.$$

Suppose $A : C_0^\infty(E) \to C_0^\infty(F)$ is a differential operator of order m and is translation invariant in $\tau > 0$. If $d = 1$, A has the form

$$A|_{X_\nu} = \sum_{q=0}^{m} A^{m-q}(\omega, D_\omega) D_\tau^q,$$

where $A^{m-q}(\omega, D_\omega)$ is a differential operator of order $m-q$ in $\omega \in \Omega_\nu$.

If $d > 1$, then A is a $d \times d$ matrix of differential operator of order m and each entry has the above form. Clearly A is a bounded operator from $W^p_{s+m,\kappa}$ to $W^p_{s,\kappa}$.

If the vector bundles E and F have the decomposition

$$E = \oplus_{j=1}^J E_j, F = \oplus_{i=1}^I F_i,$$

we can generalize the definition of weighted Sobolev spaces as

$$W^p_{s,\kappa}(E) = \oplus_{j=1}^J W^p_{s_j,\kappa}(E), W^p_{r,\kappa}(F) = \oplus_{i=1}^I W^p_{r_i,\kappa}(F).$$

Here $s = (s_1, \cdots, s_J), r = (r_1, \cdots, r_I)$ are multiple indices.

The operator A is also decomposed into $A_{ij} : C_0^\infty(E_j) \to C_0^\infty(F_i)$ with order $s_j - r_i$ (if $s_j < r_i$, we let $A_{ij} = 0$). Let $A^0(x,\xi) : E_x \to F_x$ be the principle symbol of A. We say A is elliptic with respect to (s,r) if $det(A^0(x,\xi)) \neq 0$ for any nonzero (x,ξ).

Spectrum. Let $\tilde{X} = \Omega \times \mathscr{R}$ be the full cylinder and let

$$\tilde{E} = \oplus_{j=1}^J \tilde{E}_j, \tilde{F} = \oplus_{i=1}^I \tilde{F}_i$$

are vector bundles over $\tilde{X}$ with the same rank. Suppose

$$A = A(\omega, D_\omega, D_\tau) : C_0^\infty(\tilde{E}) \to C_0^\infty(\tilde{F})$$

be a translation invariant elliptic operator of order (s,r). Then

$$A : \tilde{W}^p_{s,\kappa}(\tilde{E}) \to \tilde{W}^p_{r,\kappa}(\tilde{F})$$

is a bounded operator. Here the weights in $\tilde{W}^p_{s,\kappa}(\tilde{E})$ and $\tilde{W}^p_{r,\kappa}(\tilde{F})$ are extended over $\mathscr{R}$.

Ellipticity and analyticity in λ can be used ([2, 3]) to show

$$A(\omega, D_\omega, \lambda) : H_s^p(\tilde{E}|\Omega) \to H_r^p(F|\Omega) \tag{8}$$

is an isomorphism whenever $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}/\mathscr{C}_A$, where $\mathscr{C}_A$ is the spectrum of $A(\omega, D_\omega, \lambda)$. Denote its inverse by $R_A(\lambda)$. It is know that there are only finitely many spectrum points in any complex strip $\{\lambda : \kappa_1 < Im(\lambda) < \kappa_2\}$ and the eigenspace of each spectrum point is finite dimensional. Denote by $d(\lambda)$ the dimension of the eigenspace corresponding to the spectrum point λ and let $\mathscr{D}_A := \{Im(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda \in \mathscr{C}_A\}$.

Take $f \in C_0^\infty(F)$ and consider its Fourier transformation:

$$\hat{f}(\omega, \lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp[-i\lambda\tau] f(\omega, \tau) d\tau.$$

If $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}/\mathscr{D}_A$, then the operator

$$A_\kappa^{-1} f(\omega,\tau) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{Im\lambda=\kappa} \exp[i\lambda\tau] R_A(\lambda)\hat{f}(\omega,\lambda)d\lambda \tag{9}$$

is a bounded operator and is the inverse operator of A. We have the estimate:

$$||u||_{W^p_{s,\kappa}} \le C||Au||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}}, \tag{10}$$

where C is constant.

A priori estimate. Returning to the vector bundles E and F over X, we double their restrictions to $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+$ to define $\tilde{E}$ and $\tilde{F}$ on $\tilde{X}$. Using the parametrix method we can obtain the a priori inequality for any $\kappa\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$||u||_{W^p_{s,\kappa}} \le C(||Au||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||u||_{W^p_{s',\kappa}})\ (s'_j < s_j) \tag{11}$$

Fredholm theory. The a priori estimate is not enough to establish the Fredholm theory, since the embedding $W^p_{s',\kappa} \to W^p_{s,\kappa}$ is not compact.

Let $X_1 = X_0 \cup \{(\omega,\tau) : \omega\in\Omega, 0<\tau\le 1\}$, $\varphi_1 \in C_0^\infty(X_1)$, with $\varphi_1 = 1$ on X_0. Let $\varphi_2 = 1-\varphi_1$. By (10) and (11), for any $\kappa\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathscr{C}_A$ and $u\in W^p_{s,\kappa}$ we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
||u||_{W^p_{s\kappa}} &\le C(||\varphi_2 Au||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||\varphi_1 Au||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} \\
&\quad + ||[\varphi_1, A]u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||[\varphi_2, A]u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||\varphi_1 u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}}) \\
&\le C(||Au||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||[\varphi_1, A]u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||[\varphi_2, A]u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}} + ||\varphi_1 u||_{W^p_{r,\kappa}})
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The above inequality shows that A has finite dimensional kernel and closed range. Furthermore, Lockhart and Mcowen ([16]) proved the following theorem

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose A is elliptic with respect to (s,r) and is translation invariant in $\tau>0$. Then we have the following conclusions:*

(1) *There is a discrete set $\mathscr{D}_A\subset\mathbb{R}$ such that the operator*

$$A : W^p_{s,\kappa}(E) \to W^p_{r,\kappa}(F)$$

is Fredholm if and only if $\kappa\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathscr{D}_A$.

(2) *For $\kappa_1,\kappa_2\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathscr{D}_A$ with $\kappa_1<\kappa_2$, there is*

$$i_{\kappa_2}(A) - i_{\kappa_1}(A) = N(\kappa_1,\kappa_2),$$

where i_{κ_j} is the Fredholm index of $A : W^p_{s,\kappa_j}(E)\to W^p_{r,\kappa_j}(F)$ and $N(\kappa_1,\kappa_2) := \sum\{d(\lambda) : \lambda\in\mathscr{C}_A$ with $\kappa_1 < Im(\lambda) < \kappa_2\})$.

In general, X may have multiple cylindrical ends. Assume that there are k ends, $X(j) = \{(\omega,\tau) : \omega\in\Omega(j), \tau\in\mathbb{R}^+\}, j=1,\cdots,k,$ where $\Omega(j)$ is $n-1$-dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Then in different ends we can choose different weights κ. Let $\kappa = (\kappa(1),\cdots,\kappa(k))\in\mathbb{R}^k$ be the weight vector, then in the same way, we can discuss the weighted Sobolev spaces $W^p_{s,\kappa}(E)$ and $W^p_{r,\kappa}(F)$ and the differential operators between them. Let $A(j) = A|_{X(j)}$. Similarly we can define the corresponding quantities $\lambda(j)\in\mathscr{C}_{A(j)}, \mathscr{D}_{Aj}, d(\lambda(j))$.

Define $\mathscr{D}_A = \{(\kappa(1),\cdots,\kappa(k)) :$ for at least one $j, \kappa(j) = Im(\lambda(j))$, where $\lambda(j)\in\mathscr{C}_{A(j)}\}$. Define $\kappa_1\le\kappa_2$ is equivalent to $\kappa_1(j)\le\kappa_2(j)$ for any j. Let

$$N(\kappa_1,\kappa_2) := \sum\{d(\lambda(j)) : \lambda(j)\in(C_{A(j)}) \text{ with } \kappa_1(j) < Im(\lambda(j)) < \kappa_2(j)\}.$$

Lochhart and Mcowen([16]) had the generalization

Corollary 4.2. *If A is elliptic with respect to (s,r) and is translation invariant in each end $X(j)$. Then $A : W^p_{s,\kappa}(E) \to W^p_{r,\kappa}(F)$ is Fredholm if and only if $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \mathscr{D}_A$. If $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \mathscr{D}_A$ and $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$, then the change of Freholm index is given by*

$$i_{\kappa_2}(A) - i_{\kappa_1}(A) = N(\kappa_1, \kappa_2). \tag{13}$$

Note that when $k > 1$, $\mathscr{D}_A$ is not a discrete set but the union of $(k-1)$-dimensional hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^k$.

4.2. **Fredholm theory for $\bar\partial$ operator.** In this section, we will prove some a priori estimate of the $\bar\partial$ operator and then apply Lockhart-Mcowen's theory to the $\bar\partial$ operator in weighted Sobolev space to show that $\bar\partial$ is a Fredholm operator under some mild assumptions. However, we can't use those estimates of the last section directly. When transformed into cylindrical coordinates $z = e^{-t-i\theta}$, the norm $||\cdot||_{1,p}$ is not equivalent to the norm $||\cdot||_{W^p_{1,\kappa}}$. So we have to deduce our required estimates.

Let $\bar\partial u = f$, where $f \in C^\infty(B_1(z_l), |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$. Choose cylindrical coordinates ($z = e^{-t-i\theta}$). Let

$$u = \tilde{u} e_j$$

$$f = \tilde{f} e_j \otimes d\bar{z} = -\tilde{f} e^{i\theta - t} e_j \otimes (dt - \sqrt{-1} d\theta).$$

Using cylindrical coordinates, the equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial t} + \sqrt{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \theta} = -2 \tilde{f} e^{i\theta - t} \tag{14}$$

Since $||f||_p < \infty$, this is equivalent to

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{f}|^p e^{-p(a_j(h_l) - q_j)t - 2t} dt d\theta < \infty.$$

Let $a_{j,l} = a_j(h_l) - q_j + \frac{2}{p}$, then the integral becomes

$$\int |\tilde{f} e^{-a_{j,l} t}|^p < \infty.$$

A special solution u_s. Extend $\tilde{f}$ symmetrically to $(-\infty, \infty)$, and we get an equation of the form (14) defined on the whole real line.

The operator $\bar\partial^{t,\theta} := \frac{1}{2}(\partial_t + \sqrt{-1}\partial_\theta)$ is translation invariant, and the spectrum of the eigenvalue problem $(i\lambda + \sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta})\varphi = 0$ is $i\mathbb{Z}$. If $\kappa \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then by the result of last section, we can construct the inverse

$$\tilde{u}_s = (\bar\partial^{t,\theta})^{-1}_\kappa (-2 \tilde{f} e^{i\theta - t})$$

which satisfies the inequality

$$||\tilde{u}_s||_{W^p_{1,\kappa}} \leq C ||2 \tilde{f} e^{-t}||_{W^p_{0,\kappa}}. \tag{15}$$

For convenience, we let $u_s = \tilde{u}_s e_j = Q_s \circ (f)$.

Now choosing $\kappa - 1 = -a_{j,l}$ in (15), we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{u}_s e^{(1 - a_{j,l})t}|^p dt d\theta \leq C \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{f} e^{-a_{j,l} t}|^p.$$

So

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{u}_s e^t|^p e^{-p(a_j(h_l) - q_j)t - 2t} dt d\theta \leq C \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{f}|^p e^{-p(a_j(h_l) - q_j)t - 2t} dt d\theta,$$

which induces

$$\int_{B_1(0)} |\frac{u_s}{z}|^p |dzd\overline{z}| \leq C \int_{B_1(0)} |f|^p |dzd\overline{z}|. \tag{16}$$

On the other hand, by (15) we have the estimate of derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_1(0)} (|\partial_z \tilde{u}_s|^p + |\partial_{\overline{z}} \tilde{u}_s|^p) |z|^{p(a_j(h_l)-q_j)} |dzd\overline{z}| \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} (|\partial_t \tilde{u}_s|^p + |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_s|^p e^{pt}) e^{-p(a_j(h_l)-q_j)t} e^{-2t} dt d\theta \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} (|\partial_t \tilde{u}_s|^p + |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_s|^p) e^{p(1-a_{j,l})t} dt d\theta \\
&\leq C \int_{B_1(0)} |f|^p |dzd\overline{z}|. \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of the L^p norm of u_s, we have

$$\int |u_s|^p = \int_{S^1 \times (0,\infty)} |\tilde{u}|^p e^{-pa_{j,l}t} \leq \int_{S^1 \times (0,\infty)} |\tilde{u}|^p e^{p(1-a_{j,l})t} \leq C \int |f|^p. \tag{18}$$

Combining (17) and (18), we obtain

$$||u_s||_{L_1^p(B_1)} \leq C||f||_{L^p(B_1)}. \tag{19}$$

Now we apply the ordinary Sobolev embedding theorem to the function $\tilde{u}_s r^c$, where $c := c_{j,l} := (a_j(h_l) - q_j)$, to get the weighted Sobolev embedding inequalities for u_s.

If $p \leq 2$, then for $1 < q < \frac{2p}{2-p}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&||\tilde{u}_s r^c||_{W_0^q} \leq C||\tilde{u}_s r^c||_{W_1^p} \\
&\leq C \left(\int |\partial_r (\tilde{u}_s r^c)|^p + \frac{1}{r^p} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (\tilde{u}_s r^c) \right|^p + |\tilde{u}_s r^c|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= C \left(\int (|\partial_r \tilde{u}_s|^p + \frac{1}{r^p} |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_s|^p + \left| \frac{\tilde{u}_s}{r} \right|^p + |\tilde{u}_s|^p) r^{cp} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq C \left(\int (|\partial_r \tilde{u}_s|^p + \frac{1}{r^p} |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}_s|^p) r^{cp} + |\tilde{u}_s|^p r^{cp} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = C||u_s||_{1,p},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality comes from the relation (16). Particularly, when $p = 2$, we have for any $1 < q < \infty$,

$$||u_s||_q \leq C||u_s||_{1,2}.$$

If $p > 2$, by similar argument we have

$$||u_s||_{C^\alpha} \leq C||u_s||_{1,p},$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1 - \frac{2}{p}$.

In summary, we have

Lemma 4.3. *If $f \in L^p(B_1(0), |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$ for p satisfying the condition $a_{j,l} = a_j(h_l) - q_j + 2/p \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then the special solution $u_s = Q_s \circ f$ satisfies the following estimates:*

(1) *if $1 < p < \infty$, then*

$$||u_s||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||\frac{u_s}{z}||_{p;B_1(0)} \leq C||f||_{p;B_1(0)}; \tag{20}$$

(2) *if* $1 < p \leq 2$, *and* $1 < q < \frac{2p}{2-p}$, *then*

$$||u_s||_{q;B_1(0)} \leq C||u_s||_{1,p;B_1(0)} \leq C||f||_{p;B_1(0)}; \tag{21}$$

(3) *if* $p > 2$, *and* $0 < \alpha < 1 - \frac{2}{p}$, *then*

$$||\tilde{u}_s r^c||_{C^\alpha(B_1(0))} \leq C||u_s||_{1,p;B_1(0)} \leq C||f||_{p;B_1(0)}, \tag{22}$$

where $c = a_{j,l} - q_j$.

Estimate of the homogeneous solution. Let $u = \tilde{u}e_j$ satisfy $\bar{\partial} u = 0$ in $B_1(0)$, so we have $\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = 0$. We have the interior estimate

$$||\tilde{u}||_{W_k^s(B_1(0))} \leq C||\tilde{u}||_{W_0^s(B_1^+(0))}, \forall s > 0,$$

where $B_1^+(0)$ is a ball which is a little bit larger than $B_1(0)$.

Let $p > 1$, then for sufficiently small $s > 0$ we have

$$||\tilde{u}||^s_{W_0^s(B_1^+(0))} = \int_{B_1^+(0)} |\tilde{u}|^s |z|^{sc} |z|^{-sc}$$
$$\leq \left(\int |\tilde{u}|^p |z|^{cp} \right)^{\frac{s}{p}} \left(\int |z|^{\frac{-scp}{p-s}} \right)^{\frac{p-s}{p}}$$
$$\leq C(\int |\tilde{u}|^p |z|^{cp})^{\frac{s}{p}} = C||u||^s_p,$$

Therefore, for any $k \geq 0$ and small $s > 0$, we have

$$||\tilde{u}||_{W_k^s(B_1(0))} \leq C||u||_{p;B_1^+(0)}. \tag{23}$$

Actually, we have a refined inequality

$$||\tilde{u}||_{W_k^s(B_1(0))} \leq C||u||_{p;B_1^+(0)\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)}, \tag{24}$$

since $|u|$ is a subharmonic function and we can use the maximum principle.

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have

$$||\tilde{u}||_{C^k(B_1(0))} \leq C||u||_{p;B_1^+(0)\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)}, \forall k \geq 0.$$

Now using the C^k norm estimate, it is easy to obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $\bar{\partial} u = 0$ *and* $u \in L^p(B_1^+(0), |L_j|)$ *for* $p > 1$. *We have the estimate:*

(1) *for any* $k \geq 0$ *and* $1 < q < \infty$, *there exists a C such that*

$$||\tilde{u}||_{W_k^q(B_1(0))} \leq C||u||_{p;B_1^+(0)\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)}.$$

(2) *if* $c \geq 0$, *then for* $1 < q < \infty$, *there exists a C such that*

$$||u||_{1,q;B_1(0)} \leq C||u||_{p;B_1^+(0)\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)}.$$

(3) *if* $c < 0$, *then for* $1 < q < \frac{2}{q_j}$, *there exists a C such that the above inequality in (2) holds.*

Combining Lemma 4.3 and 4.4, we have

Corollary 4.5. *If* $c > 0$ *at* $z_l = 0$, *then for* $1 < p < 2/(1 - \bar{\delta}_j)$, *where* $\bar{\delta}_j = \min_{l:c_{jl}>0}(c_{jl})$, *there is*

$$||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||\frac{u}{z}||_{p;B_1(0)} \leq C||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)}. \tag{25}$$

Proof. For any $u \in L_1^p(B_1(z_l), |L_j|)$, there is a special solution u_s such that $\bar{\partial} u_s = \bar{\partial} u$ and satisfies

$$||u_s||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||\frac{u_s}{z}||_{p;B_1(0)} \leq C||\bar{\partial} u||_{p;B_1(0)}.$$

On the other hand, we have $\bar{\partial}(u - u_s) = 0$. So by Lemma 4.4,

$$||\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_s||_{C^0} \leq C||u - u_s||_p.$$

Therefore when $c > 0$ we have

$$\int_{B_1} \left| \frac{\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_s}{z} \right|^p |z|^{pc} \leq C||u - u_s||_p^p \int_{B_1(0)} |z|^{p(-1+c)} \leq C||u||_{1,p}.$$

This shows that

$$||\frac{u}{z}||_p \leq ||\frac{u - u_s}{z}||_p + ||\frac{u_s}{z}||_p \leq C||u||_{1,p}.$$

□

The following lemma is useful in proving inner compactness.

Lemma 4.6. *If $c \leq 0$, then for $1 < p < \infty$ and any $u = \tilde{u} e_j \in L_1^p(B_1(0), |L_j|)$ satisfying $u(0) = 0$, there is*

$$||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||\frac{u}{z}||_{p;B_1(0)} \leq C||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)}.$$

Proof. This lemma is an easy consequence of the following Hardy inequality ([8]):

$$\int_0^\infty |\frac{f(t)}{t}|^p t^\varepsilon dt \leq \left[\frac{p}{\varepsilon - p + 1} \right]^p \int_0^\infty |f'(t)|^p t^\varepsilon dt,$$

for any $f \in C_0^\infty(0, \infty), \lim_{t \to 0} f(t) = 0$ and $\varepsilon \neq p - 1$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\bar{\partial} u = f$ in $B_1^+(0)$, where $u \in L^p(B_1^+(0), |L_j|)$ and $f \in L^p(B_1^+(0), |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$. Then $u \in L_1^p(B_1^+(0), |L_j|)$ and the inequality*

$$||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)} \leq C \left(||u||_{p,B_1^+(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} + ||f||_{p,B_1^+(0)} \right) \tag{26}$$

holds if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- *$a_{j,l} = a_j(h_l) - q_j + 2/p \notin \mathbb{Z}$;*
- *either $c \geq 0$, $1 < p < \infty$ or $c < 0$, $1 < p < \frac{2}{q_j}$.*

Proof. Under the assumptions on the parameters c and p, one has

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{1,p;B_1(0)} &\leq ||u - u_s||_{1,p} + ||u_s||_{1,p} \leq C(||u - u_s||_{p,B_1^+(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} + ||f||_p) \\ &\leq C(||u||_{p,B_1^+(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} + ||u_s||_p + ||f||_p) \leq C(||u||_{p,B_1^+(0) \setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}(0)} + ||f||_{p,B_1^+(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now by the above lemma, it is easy to obtain the following global estimate.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\bar{\partial} u = f$ on Σ, where $u \in L^p(\Sigma, |L_j|)$ and $f \in L^p(\Sigma, |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$. Then $u \in L_1^p$, and the inequality*

$$||u||_{1,p} \leq C(||u||_{L^p(\Sigma \setminus \cup_{l=1}^k B_{\frac{1}{2}}(z_l))} + ||\bar{\partial} u||_p) \tag{27}$$

holds if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- *if $a_{j,l} = a_j(h_l) - q_j + 2/p \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for any $l = 1, \cdots, k$.*

- *either* $1 < p < \infty$ *in the case that* $c_{jl} \geq 0$ *at all marked points, or* $1 < p < \frac{2}{q_j}$ *if* $c_{jl} < 0$ *at some marked point.*

Now by the previous result, we will show below that $\bar{\partial} : L^p_1(\Sigma, |L_j|) \to L^p(\Sigma, |L_j| \otimes \Lambda^{0,1})$ is a Fredholm operator.

Under the coordinate transformation $z = e^{-t-i\theta}$, the neighborhood of a marked point z_l can be viewed as a half infinite cylinder. We can define the weighted Sobolev space $W^p_{s,\kappa_{j,l}(p)}$ as in last section on $B_1(z_l) \setminus \{z_l\} = (S^1 \times [0,\infty))$, where $\kappa_{j,l}(p) = -a_{j,l} = -a_j(z_l) + q_j - 2/p$. Similarly we can define the global space $W^p_{s,\kappa(p)}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{C})$, where $\kappa(p) = (\kappa_{j,1}(p), \cdots, \kappa_{j,k}(p))$. Also we have the expression:

$$\bar{\partial} = -\frac{1}{2} e^{t-i\theta}(\partial_t + \sqrt{-1}\partial_\theta). =: -e^{t-i\theta}\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}.$$

When changed to the cylinder coordinates, the space $L^p_1(B_1(z_l))$ is equivalent to the space $\hat{W}^p_{s,1+\kappa_{j,l}(p)}$ whose norm

$$||\tilde{u}||_{\hat{W}^p_{s,1+\kappa_{j,l}(p)}} = \{\int (|\tilde{u}|^p e^{\kappa_{j,l}pt}) + (|\partial_t \tilde{u}|^p + |\partial_\theta \tilde{u}|^p) e^{(1+\kappa_{j,l})pt}\}^{1/p}.$$

Now it is easy to see that the map $\bar{\partial} : L^p_1(\Sigma) \to L^p(\Sigma)$ is equivalent to the composition of the two maps

$$\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}} W^p_{0,1+\kappa(p)} \xrightarrow{-e^{t-i\theta}} W^p_{0,\kappa(p)}.$$

Since the map $-e^{t-i\theta}\cdot$ is an isomorphism, hence $\bar{\partial}$ is Fredholm iff $\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}$ is Fredholm and index$(\bar{\partial})$ = index$(\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta} : \hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)} \to W^p_{0,1+\kappa(p)})$. Lemma 4.8 shows that $\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}$ has finite-dimensional nullspace and closed image. If $\kappa(p) \notin \mathbb{Z}^k$, then by Theorem 4.1 $\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta} : W^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)} \to W^p_{0,1+\kappa(p)}$ is Fredholm, in particular the image $\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}(W^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)})$ has finite-dimensional cokernel. Since $W^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)} = \hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)} \cap W^p_{0,1+\kappa(p)}$, $\bar{\partial}^{t,\theta}(\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa(p)})$ also has finite-dimensional cokernel. Therefore we proved that $\bar{\partial}$ is Fredholm under the assumption for p.

Boundary value problem and index computation. To compute the index of $\bar{\partial}$, we need the index gluing formula and consider the related boundary value problem.

Let z_l be a marked point, and consider the restriction of the bundle $|L_j|_B$ on the disc $B_1(z_l)$. Assume that $B_1(z_l) \times \mathbb{C} \to |L_j|_B : (z,w) \to \Psi_l(z)w$ is a trivialization such that $\Psi_l(e^{i\theta})\mathbb{R}$ forms a totally real bundle on $S^1_l = \partial B_1(z_l)$. Define the space

$$L^{p,B}_1(l) := \{u \in L^p_1(B_1(z_l)) : u(e^{i\theta}) \in \Psi_l(e^{i\theta})\mathbb{R}\}.$$

Under the (t,θ) coordinates, this space is equivalent to $\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$ which is the subspace of $\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$ satisfying the boundary value condition $\tilde{u}(e^{-i\theta}) \in \Psi_l(e^{i\theta})\mathbb{R}$. Similarly, one can define the space $W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$. Also we can define the space on the interior

$$W^{p,B}_1(inn) := \{\tilde{u} \in W^p_1(\Sigma \setminus \cup_l B_1(z_l)); \tilde{u}(e^{i\theta}) \in \Psi_l(e^{i\theta})\mathbb{R} \text{ for } e^{i\theta} \in S^1_l\}.$$

The above complex Sobolev spaces can be viewed as real Sobolev spaces of real 2-dimensional vector functions and the Cauchy-Riemann operator $\bar{\partial}$ becomes a real linear Fredholm operator. By totally the same way as in the appendix of [MS], one can prove the index gluing formulas:

Lemma 4.9. (1) $\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa}) = \mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W_1^{p,B}(inn)\to W_0^p(inn)) + \sum_{l=1}^k \mathrm{index}(\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})$

(2) $\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W^p_{1,1+\kappa}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa}) = \mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W_1^{p,B}(inn)\to W_0^p(inn)) + \sum_{l=1}^k \mathrm{index}(W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})$

Theorem 4.10. *If* $1<p<\frac{2}{q_j}$ *and* $a_j(h_l)-q_j+2/p\neq 1,2$ *for any* l*, then* $\overline{\partial}:L_1^p(\Sigma,|L_j|)\to L^p(\Sigma,|L_j|\otimes\Lambda^{0,1})$ *is a Fredholm operator. In particular, if* $2<p<2/(1-\overline{\delta}_j)$ *we have the relation*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}:L_1^p(\Sigma,|L_j|)\to L^p(\Sigma,|L_j|\otimes\Lambda^{0,1}))=\\&\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W^p_{1,1+\kappa}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa})+\#\{z_l:c_{jl}<0\}\end{aligned}$$

and the index is independent of p *in the interval* $(2,2/1-\delta_j)$.

Proof. We have already proved that $\overline{\partial}:L_1^p(\Sigma,|L_j|)\to L^p(\Sigma,|L_j|\otimes\Lambda^{0,1})$ is a Fredholm operator if $1<p<2/q_j$ and $a_j(h_l)-q_j+2/p\neq 1,2$. Since the index of $\overline{\partial}$ is equal to the index of $\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa}$, by Lemma 4.9 we only need to compare the index of the operators $\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$ and $\overline{\partial}:W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$ near each marked point z_l. Corollary 4.5 shows that if $2<p<2/1-\overline{\delta}_j$ then $W^p_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}=\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\cap W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}}=\hat{W}^p_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}$. Therefore near marked points with $c_{jl}>0$, the two indices are equal. The rest case is to compare the indices near marked points with $c_{jl}<0$.

If $c_{jl}<0$ at z_l, we have $0<1+\kappa_{j,l}<1$ if $2<p<2/q_j$. If $p>2$, we have the inclusion $W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\subset W_0^2$ which implies that

$$\mathrm{coker}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})=\mathrm{coker}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}}).$$

On the other hand, since the group action is trivial for the resolved bundle $|L_j|\to S^1\times[0,\infty)$, the localization Ψ_l obtained by resolving operation satisfies $\Psi_l(e^{i\theta})\mathbb{R}=\mathbb{R}$. Thus if $\tilde{u}\in\ker(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})$, then $\tilde{u}|_{S^1\times\{0\}}$ is a real function. In particular a real number is an element in the kernel. By Lemma 4.6, we know that

$$\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\cap\{\tilde{u}\in C(S^1\times[0,\infty)):\tilde{u}(\infty)=0\}=W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}.$$

So combining those consideration, we have

$$\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:\hat{W}^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})=\mathrm{index}(\overline{\partial}^{t,\theta}:W^{p,B}_{1,1+\kappa_{j,l}}\to W^p_{0,1+\kappa_{j,l}})+1.$$

By Lemma 4.9, we obtain the conclusion. □

Remark 4.11. In Theorem 4.10 we only proved an index transformation formula for $2<p<2/(1-\overline{\delta}_j)$ and have not considered the case for general p and not computed the concrete index. One reason is that the moduli problem we consider is based on orbicurves—not the resolved curves, for which we can't do the gluing operation. However the analysis on resolved curves is more understandable, and the result is easily translated into results on orbicurves. Therefore, we concentrates only on the analysis of resolved curves.

5. INNER COMPACTNESS OF THE SOLUTION SPACES OF W-SPIN EQUATIONS

In this section, we will discuss the compactness problem for the W-spin equations. We will prove if R, the sum of the residues of $W(u_1,\ldots,u_t)$ at each Ramond marked point, is finite, then the corresponding solution space is compact, hence the so-called “inner compactness” holds. However, as shown by Example 3.2, if R is infinite, then the space of the regular solutions is not compact. The singular solutions of the W-spin equations should be added to compactify the solution space.

Above all we prove that the regular solutions of the W-spin equations lie in L_1^p space for some $p > 2$.

Denote by $P_i(u)$ the nonlinear term of the W-spin equations (4). Then $u_i = u_{i,s} + (u_i - u_{i,s})$, where $u_{i,s} = -Q_s \circ P_i(u)$ is the special solution we constructed before. We have the estimate by (2) of Lemma 4.3

$$||u_{i,s}||_{q;B_1(z_l)} \leq C||u_{i,s}||_{1,2;B_1(z_l)} \leq C||P_i(u)||_{2;B_1(z_l)}, \tag{28}$$

for any $1 < q < \infty$. On the other hand, $u_i - u_{i,s}$ is a meromorphic section with a possible singularity at the marked points. Since $u_i - u_{i,s} \in L_1^2$, by the restriction of integrability, $u_i - u_{i,s}$ should be a holomorphic section by (1) of Lemma 4.4.

There are two cases:

(1) if $c_{il} \geq 0$, then by (2) of Lemma 4.4, $u_i - u_{i,s}$ is L^q integrable for any q with $1 < q < \infty$.
(2) if $c_{il} < 0$, then by (3) of Lemma 4.4, $u_i - u_{i,s}$ is L^q integrable for $1 < q < \frac{2}{q_i}$.

So, at least u_i is L^q integrable for $1 < q < \frac{2}{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, t$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.4, we have

$$||u_i - u_{i,s}||_{q,B_1(z_l)} \leq C||u_i - u_{i,s}||_{2;B_1(z_l)} \leq C(||u_i||_{2;B_1(z_l)} + ||u_{i,s}||_{2;B_1(z_l)}), \tag{29}$$

for $1 < q < \frac{2}{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, t$. The inequalities (29) and (28) induce

$$||u_i||_{q;B_1(z_l)} \leq C(||u_i||_{2;B_1(z_l)} + ||P_i(u)||_{2;B_1(z_l)}), \tag{30}$$

for $1 < q < \frac{2}{q_i}, i = 1, \ldots, t$.

Remark 5.1. We can use the global L^p-estimate of the $\bar{\partial}$ operator in weighted Sobolev space to get the estimate of the L_1^p norm, but the classical Sobolev embedding theorem can't be used here to get the estimate of the L^q norm.

We estimate the norm $\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_p^p$ for some $p > 2$. For simplicity, we take a monomial W_l. Since $\Sigma_j b_{lj} q_j = 1$, we have $b_{lj} q_j < 1$ for each j. Choose p, ε such that $0 < \varepsilon < q_i, 2 \leq p$ and $p(1-\varepsilon) < 2$.

If $b_{li} \neq 1$, we can choose the Hölder index group

$$\left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{l1}q_1}, \ldots, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{(b_{li}-1)q_i}, \ldots, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{lt}q_t}, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{q_i-\varepsilon}\right)$$

for small ε such that each entry greater than 1. By the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\left|\frac{\partial W_l}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_{p;B_1(z_l)}^p &= \int |u_1|^{pb_{l1}} \ldots |u_i|^{(b_{li}-1)p} \ldots |u_t|^{pb_{lt}} \\ &\leq \left(\int |u_1|^{\frac{p(1-\varepsilon)}{q_1}}\right)^{\frac{q_1 b_{l1}}{1-\varepsilon}} \ldots \left(\int |u_i|^{\frac{p(1-\varepsilon)}{q_i}}\right)^{\frac{q_i(b_{li}-1)}{1-\varepsilon}} \ldots \left(\int |u_t|^{\frac{p(1-\varepsilon)}{q_t}}\right)^{\frac{q_t b_{lt}}{1-\varepsilon}} |\Sigma|^{\frac{q_i-\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq C(||u_i||_2, ||P_i(u)||_2) \leq \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

If $b_{li} = 1$, we use, instead, the following Hölder index group to obtain the analogous estimate:

$$\left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{l1}q_1},\dots,\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{li-1}q_{i-1}},\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{li+1}q_{i+1}}\dots,\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_{lt}q_t},\frac{1-\varepsilon}{q_i-\varepsilon}\right).$$

Thus, if we let $\delta = \min\{q_1,\dots,q_t\}$ and choose $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-\delta}$, then $\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}$ is L^p integrable for any i. Combining the interior estimate and the estimate near the marked points, we obtain

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose* $(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ *are solutions of the* W*-spin equations (4), then* u_i *is* L^p_1 *integrable and* $\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}$ *is* L^p *integrable for* $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-q_i}$, *and there is the estimate*

$$||u_i||_{1,p} \le C\left(||u_i||_p + \left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_p\right) \le C\left(||u_i||_2, \left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_2\right),$$

where $C(||u_i||_2, ||\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}||_2)$ *is a constant depending on the norms* $||u_i||_2$, *and* $\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_2$.

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose* u *is the solution of an* r*-spin equation, then* u *is smooth away from the marked points and is* L^p_1 *integrable for* $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-\frac{1}{r}}$.

By the above lemma and using the classical Sobolev embedding theorem near the Ramond marked points (since in this case the weighted norm control the classical norm), we know each $\tilde{u}_i$ is continuous at marked point z_l with $c_{il} < 0$ and have the estimate:

$$|\tilde{u}_i|_{C^0} \le C||\tilde{u}_i||_{W^p_1(B_1(z_l))} \le C||u_i||_{1,p;B_1(z_l)}. \tag{32}$$

Therefore, we can give the following definition.

Definition 5.4. Suppose that z is a Ramond point and W_j is a Ramond monomial in W, then for sections $u_i, i = 1,\dots,t$, $W_j(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ lies in the log-canonical bundle K_{log}. Then ResW_j at z is defined as the coefficient of the base $\frac{dz}{z}$. If locally we have the representation $u_i = \tilde{u}_i e_i$, then Res$W_j(u_1,\dots,u_t)|_z = W_j(\tilde{u}_1(z),\dots,\tilde{u}_t(z))$.

Further estimate of the W-spin equations
Consider the following integral

$$\sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}}\right)\right)_{L^2}$$

over Σ.

We will show that the Neveu-Schwarz marked points and the Ramond marked points have different contributions to the integral. For simplicity, we assume there is only one marked point on a smooth curve Σ.

1. Assume at this marked point $z_l = 0$ that the monomial W_j is Ramond, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_i (\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1(\overline{\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}}))_{L^2(\Sigma)} = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sum_i (\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1(\overline{\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}}))_{L^2(\Sigma \setminus B_\varepsilon(0))} \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sum_i \int_{\Sigma \setminus B_\varepsilon(0)} (\frac{\bar{\partial} \tilde{u}_i}{\partial \bar{z}} d\bar{z} \otimes e_i, \overline{\frac{\partial W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_t)}{\partial \tilde{u}_i} \frac{1}{z}} |e_i'|^2 e_i \otimes d\bar{z}) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sum_i \int \frac{\bar{\partial} \tilde{u}_i}{\partial \bar{z}} \frac{\partial W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_t)}{\partial \tilde{u}_i} \frac{1}{z} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \quad (\text{since } * (|e_i'|^2 e_i = e_i')) \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \int \frac{\bar{\partial}}{\partial \bar{z}} (W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_t)) \frac{1}{z} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \int_{\partial B_\varepsilon(0)} \frac{W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_t)}{z} dz = -\pi W_j(\tilde{u}_1(0), \dots, \tilde{u}_t(0)).
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Assume at this marked point that W_j is Neveu-Schwarz. Furthermore without loss of generality, we can assume that for $1 \leq i \leq t_l$ the bundles $|L_i|$ are Ramond and for $t_l + 1 \leq i \leq t$ the bundles $|L_i|$ are Neveu-Schwarz.

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_i (\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1(\overline{\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}}))_{L^2} = \sum_i \int (\frac{\bar{\partial} \tilde{u}_i}{\partial \bar{z}} d\bar{z} \otimes e_i, \overline{\frac{\partial W_j(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_t)}{\partial \tilde{u}_i} z^{\sum_{s=1}^t b_{js}(a_s(h_0) - q_s)}} |e_i'|^2 e_i \otimes d\bar{z}) \\
&= \lim_{z \to 0} -\pi W_j(\tilde{u}_1(z), \dots, \tilde{u}_t(z)) z^{\sum_{s=1}^t b_{js}(a_s(h_0))}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $1 \leq i \leq t_l$, then $a_i(h_0) = 0$. the C^0 norm of $\tilde{u}_i$ is controlled by inequality (32). If $t_l + 1 \leq i \leq t$, $c_{i0} \leq 0$ and $a_i(h_0) > 0$, we still have the control of the C^0 norm by (32). Assume that $t_l + 1 \leq i \leq t$ and $c_{i0} > 0$. By Corollary 4.5, if $2 \leq p < \frac{2}{1 - \delta_i}$, then

$$
||u_i||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||\frac{u_i}{z}||_{p,B_1(0)} \leq C \left(||u_i||_2, \left|\left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \right|\right|_2 \right).
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
||\tilde{u}_i r^{c_{i0}}||_{W_1^p(B_1(0))} \leq C \left(||u_i||_2, \left|\left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \right|\right|_2 \right), \tag{33}
$$

for $c_{i0} > 0$.

By the Sobolev embedding inequality, we have

$$
|\tilde{u}_i(z) r^{c_{i0}}|_{C^0(B_1(0))} \leq C \left(||u_i||_2, \left|\left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \right|\right|_2 \right).
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|W_j(\tilde{u}_1(z), \dots, \tilde{u}_t(z)) z^{\sum_{s=1}^t b_{js}(a_s(h_0))}| \\
&\leq C \left(||u_i||_2, \left|\left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \right|\right|_2 \right) r^{\min_{t_l+1 \leq i \leq t} \{a_i(h_0), q_i\}}
\end{aligned}
$$

So we have

$$
\sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1 \left(\overline{\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}} \right) \right)_{L^2} = 0.
$$

If Σ is a nodal curve, then by a similar argument, we can prove that the nodal points make no contribution to the integral.

In general, if there are multiple marked points, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}}\right)\right)_{L^2} = \sum_j \sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}}\right)\right)_{L^2} \\
&= -\pi \sum_{z_l: Ramond} \sum_{j: W_j isRamond} W_j(\tilde{u}_1(z_l), \ldots, \tilde{u}_t(z_l)) \\
&= -\pi \sum_{z_l: Ramond} \sum_{j: W_j isRamond} \mathrm{Res} W_j(u_1, \ldots, u_t)|_{z_l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $R := \sum_{z_l: Ramond} \sum_{j: W_j isRamond} \mathrm{Res} W_j(u_1, \ldots, u_t)|_{z_l}$, then we have

$$0 = \sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, \bar{\partial} u_i + I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}}\right)\right)_{L^2} = ||\bar{\partial} u||_2^2 - \pi R.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\sum_i ||\bar{\partial} u_i||_2^2 = \pi R. \tag{34}$$

and so

$$\sum_i \left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_2^2 = \pi R. \tag{35}$$

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that $u_i, i = 1, \cdots, t$, are regular solutions of the W-spin equation. Let $R := \sum_{z_l: Ramond} \sum_{j: W_j isRamond} Res W_j(u_1, \ldots, u_t)|_{z_l}$, then we have*

$$\sum_i ||\bar{\partial} u_i||_2^2 = \sum_i \left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_2^2 = \pi R.$$

Corollary 5.6 (Witten's lemma). *Assume that W is non-degenerate. If all the marked points on Σ are Neveu-Schwarz points, then the only regular solution of the W-spin equation is the zero solution.*

By inequality (33), we obtain the following proposition about the smoothness of $\tilde{u}_i$ at the marked point z_0 with $c_{i0} > 0$:

Proposition 5.7. *Assume z_0 is a Neveu-Schwarz point of $|L_i|$ with $c_{i0} > 0$, then $\tilde{u}_i |z|^{a_i(h_0) - q_i}$ is continuous at z_0.*

Controlling norms of u_i by R

Our aim is to control the suitable norms (Sobolev norms or Hölder continuous norms) of the solutions u_i by R, the sum of residues of W at Ramond marked points.

Theorem 5.8. *Let $W \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a non-degenerate, quasi-homogeneous polynomial with weights $q_i := \mathrm{wt}(x_i) < 1$ for each variable x_i, with $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then for any n-tuple $(u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ we have*

$$|u_i| \leq C \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}(u_1, \ldots, u_n)\right| + 1\right)^{\delta_i},$$

where $\delta_i = \frac{q_i}{\min_j (1 - q_j)}$ and the constant C depends only on W. If $q_i \leq 1/2$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then $\delta_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. If $q_i < 1/2$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then $\delta_i < 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

An immediate corollary is the following.

Corollary 5.9. *Let $W \in \mathbb{C}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ be a non-degenerate, quasi-homogeneous polynomial with weights $q_i := \mathrm{wt}(x_i) \leq 1/2$. If $(u_1,\ldots,u_n)$ are regular solutions of the W-spin equations, then u_i is L^p_1 integrable and $\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}$ is L^p integrable for $2 \leq p < \frac{2}{1-q_i}$, and we have the estimate*

$$||u_i||_{1,p} \leq C\left(\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}\right|\right|_2 + 1\right),$$

where C is a constant independent of u_i, for all $i = 1,\ldots,t$.

The proof of the theorem depends primarily on the following.

Lemma 5.10. *For any non-degenerate, quasi-homogeneous polynomial $W \in \mathbb{C}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ and any n-tuple $s_1,\ldots,s_n \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the values $(u_1,\ldots,u_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ that satisfy*

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}(u_1,\ldots,u_n) = s_i$$

also satisfy a quasi-homogeneous polynomial

$$p_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{C}[s_1,\ldots,s_n][x_i]$$

whose highest degree term in x_i is constant (that is, independent of $s_1,\ldots,s_n$).

The polynomial p_i corresponds to a sort of "resultant" of the polynomials $f_i := \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} - s_i$.

Proof (of Lemma 5.10). Since W is quasi-homogeneous, the polynomials $f_i := \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i} - s_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_1,\ldots,x_n,s_1,\ldots,s_n]$ are also quasi-homogeneous, of total weight $1-q_i$, provided s_i is assigned weight $1-q_i$ as well. Let X denote the closed subvariety of weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}^{2n-1}_{(q_1,\ldots,q_n,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$ defined by the vanishing of all the f_i:

$$X = Z(f_1,\ldots,f_n) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}_{(q_1,\ldots,q_n,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}.$$

Any point of X of the form $(a_1;\ldots;a_i;\ldots;a_n;0;\ldots;0)$ corresponds to a non-trivial solution of $\frac{\partial W}{\partial X_j} = 0$; thus the linear subspace

$$E_i := Z(x_i,s_1,\ldots,s_n) = \{(a_1;\ldots;0;\ldots a_n;0;\ldots;0)\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{2n-1}_{(q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$$

does not intersect X when W is non-degenerate.

The projection π_i from E_i to the subspace $\{(0;\ldots;x_i;0;\ldots;0;s_1;\ldots;s_n)\} \cong \mathbb{P}^n_{(q_1,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$ is a proper morphism of projective varieties, and thus the image $\pi_i(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n_{(q_i,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$ is a closed subvariety. Moreover, $\pi_i(X)$ is not all of $\mathbb{P}^n_{(q_i,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$; otherwise the point $(1;0;\ldots;0) \in \mathbb{P}^n_{(q_i,1-q_1,\ldots,1-q_n)}$ would have a point in X lying over it, and that would contradict the non-degeneracy of W. Consequently, $\pi_i(X)$ lies in a hypersurface defined by a quasi-homogeneous polynomial $p_i \in \mathbb{C}[x_i,s_1,\ldots,s_n]$, such that $p_i(1;0\ldots;0)$ is not zero.

In particular, if we write p_i as a polynomial in x_i with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[s_1,\ldots,s_n]$, then the leading coefficient is constant—independent of $s_1,\ldots,s_n$. □

Writing p_i as a polynomial in x_i, we have

$$p_i(x_i) = \sum_{l=0}^{N} c_l(s_1,\ldots,s_n)x_i^{N-l}.$$

To bound the size of x_i in terms of the s_j, we must calculate bounds on the degree in s_j of each coefficient c_l. For each l, each term of c_l will be of the form $\alpha s_1^{\sigma_1}\cdots s_n^{\sigma_n}$ for some non-negative integers σ_j and for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Since p_i is quasi-homogeneous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Nq_i &= (N-l)q_i + \sum_j \mathrm{wt}(s_j)\sigma_j \\ &= (N-l)q_i + \sum_j (1-q_j)\sigma_j. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$lq_i \geq \left(\sum_j \sigma_j\right) \min_j \{1-q_j\}.$$

Letting $\delta_i = \frac{q_i}{\min_j(1-q_j)}$, we have

$$l\delta_i \geq \sum_j \sigma_j.$$

This gives

$$|c_l(s_1,\dots,s_n)| \leq K(\sum_j |s_j|+1)^{l\delta_i}$$

for some constant K, depending on l and W, but independent of all s_j.

The following lemma is a simple consequence of the Geršgorin disc theorem and is the final tool that we need to bound the roots of the polynomial p_i.

Lemma 5.11. *For any polynomial $f(x) = x^N + \sum_{l=1}^N \alpha_l x^{l-1}$, and any N-tuple of positive real numbers $\rho_1,\dots,\rho_N$, let D be the maximum of $\rho_l/\rho_{l-1} + \rho_l\alpha_l/\rho_N$ for $N \geq l \geq 2$ and $\rho_1\alpha_1/\rho_N$. Then the roots of f lie in the circle*

$$\{|z| \leq D\}.$$

Proof. The lemma follows immediately from applying the Geršgorin disc theorem [7, Thm 6.1.1] to the $N \times N$ matrix BA_fB^{-1}, where B is the diagonal matrix $B := \mathrm{diag}(\rho_1,\dots,\rho_N)$, and A_f is the companion matrix [7, Def 3.3.13] of f. □

Applying Lemma 5.11 with $\rho_l = \left(\sum_j |s_j|+1\right)^{l\delta_i}$ and $f = p_i$ shows that the roots of p_i are bounded by

$$|x_i| \leq C\left(\sum_j |s_j|+1\right)^{\delta_i}$$

for some constant C that depends only on W. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.8.

Remark 5.12. The non-degeneracy of W is essential to the proof of Theorem 5.8. For example, if $W = u^2v^2 + u^4$ then both partial derivatives are zero for $u = 0$ and v arbitrary; thus we cannot control v by the partial derivatives.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Suppose that $\{u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n\}$ is a sequence of solutions of the W-spin equation

$$\bar{\partial} u_i^n + I_1\left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)\right) = 0.$$

Let $u_i^n = \tilde{u}_i^n e_i$ in a local coordinate. We will discuss the compactness of the solutions in two domains.

(1). Compactness in the interior domain away from the marked points.

In this case, the W-spin equations have the following form:

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}_i^n + \overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \tilde{u}_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^n)\phi} = 0,$$

where ϕ is a C^∞ function. By Corollary 5.9, we have

$$||\tilde{u}_i^n||_{W_1^p(inn)} \le C_R.$$

Here "inn" means the inner domain which has a positive distance to those marked points. Therefore, by the standard argument of compactness, there exists a C^∞ function $\tilde{u}_i$ and a subsequence $\tilde{u}_i^n$ (same notation as earlier) such that

$$\tilde{u}_i^n \to \tilde{u}_i \text{ in } C^k \text{ and ordinary } W_k^p \text{ norms,}$$

for any integer $k \ge 0$. The $\tilde{u}_i$ are certainly solutions of the W-spin equations in the interior part.

(2). Compactness near marked points.

Let $|L_i|$ is Neveu-Schwarz at z_l with $c_{il} > 0$. Then by Corollary 4.5 and Corollary 5.9, we obtain

$$||u_i^n||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + \left|\left|\frac{u_i^n}{z}\right|\right|_{p,B_1(0)} \le C_R, \tag{36}$$

for $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-\delta_i}$. This is equivalent to

$$||\tilde{u}_i^n r^{c_{il}}||_{W_1^p(B_1(0))} \le C_R. \tag{37}$$

Obviously this also holds for $c_{il} = 0$.

Using the ordinary Sobolev compact embedding theorem, there exists a $\tilde{u}_i$ such that $\tilde{u}_i r^{c_{il}} \in C^{\alpha_i} \cap W_0^q$ (ordinary q norm) for $0 < \alpha_i < \delta_i, 1 < q < \infty$, and

$$\tilde{u}_i^n r^{c_{il}} \to \tilde{u}_i r^{c_{il}} \text{ in } C^{\alpha_i'}, \tag{38}$$

where $0 < \alpha_i' < \alpha_i$.

If $|L_i|$ is Ramond or Neveu-Schwarz at z_l with $c_{il} < 0$, the inequality (36) is not true for $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-\delta_i}$; so we can't use the same argument in this case that we did in the Neveu-Schwarz case. Let $u_{i,s}^n = -Q_s \circ P_i(u^n)$, since $\tilde{u}_{i,s}^n(0) = 0$, we have the decomposition

$$\tilde{u}_i^n = \tilde{u}_i^n - \tilde{u}_i^n(0) + (\tilde{u}_i^n - \tilde{u}_{i,s}^n)(0).$$

By Lemma 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{u}_i^n(0)| &= |(\tilde{u}_i^n - \tilde{u}_{i,s}^n)(0)| \le C||u_i^n - u_{i,s}^n||_{2,B_1(0)} \\ &\le C(||u_i^n||_{2,B_1(0)} + ||u_{i,s}^n||_{2,B_1(0)}) \le C_R. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

So there exists a constant A_i such that $\tilde{u}_i^n(0) \to A_i$ (of course, we take the subsequence as usual).

On the other hand, if $2 \le p < \frac{2}{1-q_i}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_i^n - u_i^n(0)||_{1,p;B_1(0)} &\le ||u_i^n||_{1,p;B_1(0)} + ||u_i^n(0)||_{p,B_1(0)} \\ &\le C_R + \left(\int |z|^{-pq_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} |\tilde{u}_i^n(0)| \le C_R. \end{aligned}$$

We show that the ordinary W_1^p norm of $(\tilde{u}_i^n(z) - \tilde{u}_i^n(0))r^{-q_i}$ can be controlled by its weighted norm $||\cdot||_{1,p}$. Actually by Lemma 4.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&||\tilde{u}_i^n(z)-\tilde{u}_i^n(0)r^{-q_i}||_{W_1^p(B_1(0))}\\
&\leq C\left(||u_i^n(z)-u_i^n(0)||_{1,p;B_1(0)}+||\frac{u_i^n(z)-u_i^n(0)}{z}||_{p;B_1(0)}\right)\\
&\leq C||u_i^n(z)-u_i^n(0)||_{1,p;B_1(0)}\leq C_R.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Sobolev compact embedding theorem, there exists a subsequence and a function $\tilde{v}_i$ such that

$$(\tilde{u}_i^n(z)-\tilde{u}_i^n(0))r^{-q_i}\rightarrow\tilde{v}_ir^{-q_i}\text{ in }C^{\alpha},\qquad\text{for }0<\alpha<q_i.$$

In particular, for every $\varepsilon>0$, there exists N such that for all $n>N$,

$$|\tilde{u}_i^n-\tilde{u}_i^n(0)-\tilde{v}_i|\leq\varepsilon r^{q_i}.$$

Therefore, for all $z\in B_1(0)$,

$$|\tilde{u}_i^n(z)-A_i-\tilde{v}_i(z)|\leq\varepsilon(1+r^{q_i})\leq C\varepsilon,$$

i.e., $\tilde{u}_i^n\rightarrow A_i+\tilde{v}_i:=\tilde{u}_i$ in $C^0(B_1(0))$.

We need estimate the following term:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\ldots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\ldots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_p\leq\sum_j\left|\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\ldots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\ldots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_p\\
&=\sum_j\left|\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^nr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^mr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right|\right|_{W_0^p}.
\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

Assume that $|L_i|, 1\leq i\leq t_l$, is line bundle with $c_{il}\leq 0$ at z_l, where $0\leq t_l\leq t$, and $|L_i|$ is line bundle with $c_{il}>0$ for $i\geq t_l+1$. There are two cases which may happen for each monomial W_j:

Case 1. If $i>t_l$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^nr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^mr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right|\right|_{W_0^p}\\
&\leq\left|\left|\left(\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right)r^{-\sum_{1\leq k\leq t_l}b_{jk}q_k}\right|\right|_{W_0^p}\\
&\leq\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0}\left(|z|^{(-1+q_i)p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

Case 2. If $i\leq t_l$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^nr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^mr^{c_{1l}},\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right|\right|_{W_0^p}\\
&\leq\left|\left|\left(\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right)r^{-\sum_{1\leq k\leq t_l}b_{jk}q_k}\right|\right|_{W_0^p}\\
&\leq\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^nr^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\ldots,\tilde{u}_t^mr^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0}\left(|z|^{(-1+\delta)p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

Therefore, in either cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\dots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_p \le \sum_j \left|\left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\dots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_p\\
&\le \sum_j \left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^n r^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^m r^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0}\left(|z|^{(-1+\delta)p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&\le C\sum_j \left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^n r^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^m r^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0},
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $\delta=\min\{q_1,\cdots,q_t\}$ and $2\le p<\frac{2}{1-\delta}$.

By Lemma 4.7 and (43), we have for any $2\le p<\frac{2}{1-\delta}$, $i\ge t_l$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&||u_i^n-u_i^m||_{1,p;B_1(0)} \le C\left(||u_i^n-u_i^m||_{p;B_1^+(0)}+\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\dots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_{p;B_1^+(0)}\right)\\
&= C\Big(||(\tilde{u}_i^n-\tilde{u}_i^m)r^{c_{il}}||_{W_0^p(B_1^+(0))}\\
&+\sum_j \left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^n r^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^m r^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

By the C^0 convergence of $\tilde{u}_k^n$ for $1\le k\le t_l$ and $\tilde{u}_k^n r^{c_{kl}}$ for $t_l+1\le k\le t$, we know that $\{u_i^n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L_1^p(B_1(0))$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_i^n\to u_i \text{ in } L_1^p\\
&\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)\to\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1,\dots,u_t) \text{ in } L^p
\end{aligned}$$

for $2\le p<\frac{2}{1-\delta}$ and $i\ge t_l$.

If $1\le i\le t_l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&||u_i^n-u_i^m||_{1,p;B_1(0)} \le C\left(||u_i^n-u_i^m||_{p;B_1^+(0)}+\left|\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)-\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^m,\dots,u_t^m)\right|\right|_{p;B_1^+(0)}\right)\\
&= C\Bigg(|(\tilde{u}_i^n-\tilde{u}_i^m)|_{C^0}\left(\int |z|^{-pq_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&+\sum_j \left|\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^n,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^n r^{c_{tl}})-\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial u_i}(\tilde{u}_1^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_{t_l}^m,\dots,\tilde{u}_t^m r^{c_{tl}})\right|_{C^0}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

This also shows that $\{u_i^n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in L_1^p and

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_i^n\to u_i \text{ in } L_1^p\\
&\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1^n,\dots,u_t^n)\to\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}(u_1,\dots,u_t) \text{ in } L^p
\end{aligned}$$

for $2\le p<\frac{2}{1-\delta}$.

In summary, $(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ is a solution of the W-spin equations in $B_1(0)$. □

6. COMPACTIFYING THE SOLUTION SPACE OF THE W-SPIN EQUATION

As shown in Example 3.2, the space of the regular solutions may not be compact. To compactify this space, we need to add those solutions having a singularity at Ramond marked points. First, we give a definition of those solutions.

Definition 6.1. The sections $(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ are called the *singular solutions* of the W-spin equations if $u_i \in L^2_{1,loc}(\Sigma\setminus \text{Ramond marked points})$, $\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \in L^2_{loc}(\Sigma\setminus\text{Ramond marked points})$, and they satisfy the W-spin equations pointwise away from the Ramond marked points and are not regular solutions of the W-spin equations.

To compactify the solution space in a suitable topology, we have to consider the asymptotic behavior of the singular solutions near the Ramond marked points. First, we deduce some basic estimates of the general W-spin equations.

Assume that 0 is the unique Ramond marked point in $B_2(0)$ and that $(u_1,\dots,u_t)$ is a singular solution in $B_2(0)-\{0\}$ of the W-spin equation. Let $u_j=\tilde{u}_j e_j$, then locally the W-spin equation can be written as

$$\frac{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}_i}{\partial\bar{z}}+\sum_j \overline{\frac{\partial W_j(\tilde{u}_1,\dots,\tilde{u}_t)}{\partial\tilde{u}_i} z^{\Sigma_{s=1}^t b_{js}(a_s(h_l)-q_s)}}|e_i'|^2=0. \tag{44}$$

If we set $\tilde{u}_j=\varphi_j z^{q_j-a_j}$, then an easy computation shows that the above W-spin equation has the following simple form:

$$\bar{\partial}\varphi_j+\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_j}}=0, \qquad \text{for all } j=1,\dots,t. \tag{45}$$

Note that the φ_j's are only locally defined, though their norms are well-defined in a neighborhood of the origin.

First, by Equation (45), we have the identity

$$\partial_{\bar{z}}W(\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_t)=-\sum_i\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2. \tag{46}$$

Since W is a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, it is easy to show

$$\sum_i q_i x_i \partial_{x_i} W = W(x_1,\dots,x_t). \tag{47}$$

By Equation (45) and Identity (47), we have

$$\sum_i q_i \partial_{\bar{z}}\varphi_i\cdot\bar{\varphi}_i+\overline{W}=0. \tag{48}$$

Taking the derivative ∂_z of the above equation, we have

$$\sum_i q_i\partial_z\partial_{\bar{z}}\varphi_i\cdot\bar{\varphi}_i+\sum_i q_i|\partial_{\bar{z}}\varphi_i|^2+\overline{\partial_{\bar{z}}W}=0. \tag{49}$$

By Equation (45) and (46), we obtain

$$\sum_i q_i\partial_z\partial_{\bar{z}}\varphi_i\cdot\bar{\varphi}_i=\sum_i(1-q_i)\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2. \tag{50}$$

Therefore, by Equation (50), we have the important equation for the norm $N(z) := \sum_i q_i|\varphi_i|^2$:

$$\Delta(\sum_i q_i|\varphi_i|^2) = \sum_i 8(1-q_i)\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}\right|^2 + \sum_i 4q_i(|\partial_z\varphi_i|^2 + |\partial_{\bar{z}}\varphi_i|^2). \tag{51}$$

This implies the maximum principle (see[CW]).

Lemma 6.2. *For any* $p > 0, 0 < \theta < 1$ *and any* $R > 0$ *such that* $B_R(z) \in B_2(0) - \{0\}$, $z \in B_2(0) - \{0\}$, *we have*

$$\sup_{B_{\theta R}(z)} N(z) \le C\left(\frac{1}{|B_R(z)|}\int_{B_R(z)} N(z)^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{52}$$

To get a pointwise estimate of the upper bound for the solutions, we need a uniform local integral estimate of $N(z)$. At first we will discuss the A_{r-1} case, since it is simpler than the general case and we can get better estimates. Subsequently, we will consider the general W-case for $W = W(x_1,\dots,x_t)$ a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with all weights $\mathrm{wt}(x_i) < 1/2$.

The A_{r-1} case

If $W = x^r$, then the W-spin equation (45) becomes the A_{r-1}-spin equation:

$$\varphi_{\bar{z}} + r\overline{\varphi}^{r-1} = 0. \tag{53}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let* φ *be a solution of (53) in* $B_2(0) - \{0\}$, *then there exists a constant* C_r *only depending on r such that for any* $z \in B_2(0) - \{0\}$,

$$|\varphi(z)| \le C_r|z|^{-\frac{1}{r-2}} \tag{54}$$

$$|D^\alpha\varphi(z)| \le C_r|z|^{-\frac{1}{r-2}-|\alpha|}. \tag{55}$$

Proof. Equation (46) becomes

$$(\varphi^r)_{\bar{z}} + r^2|\varphi|^{2(r-1)} = 0. \tag{56}$$

Let ψ^β, for $\beta > 0$, be a cut-off function with support away from the origin. We have

$$\int (\varphi^r)_{\bar{z}}\psi^\beta + r^2|\varphi|^{2(r-1)}\psi^\beta = 0.$$

Integrating by parts and using the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int r^2|\varphi|^{2(r-1)}\psi^\beta = \int \varphi^r\beta\psi^{\beta-1}\psi_{\bar{z}} \\ &\le \int |\varphi|^r\beta\psi^{\beta-1}|\psi_{\bar{z}}| \\ &\le \beta\left(\int|\varphi|^{2(r-1)}\psi^\beta\right)^{\frac{r}{2(r-1)}}\left(\int(\psi^{\beta\frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}-1}|\psi_{\bar{z}}|)^{\frac{2(r-1)}{(r-2)}}\right)^{\frac{r-2}{2(r-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\int|\varphi|^{2(r-1)}\psi^\beta \le C_r\int\psi^{\beta-\frac{2(r-1)}{(r-2)}}|\psi_{\bar{z}}|^{\frac{2(r-1)}{r-2}}. \tag{57}$$

Now we take $\beta = \frac{2(r-1)}{r-2}$ and choose ψ satisfying the requirement that $\psi = 1$ in $B_{\frac{|z|}{4}}(z)$, vanishing outside $B_{\frac{|z|}{2}}(z)$ and $|\nabla\psi| \leq \frac{4}{|z|}$. Here $z \neq 0$. Thus we obtain from (57) the following estimate,

$$\int_{B_{\frac{|z|}{4}(z)}(z)} |\varphi|^{2(r-1)} \leq C_r \int_{B_{\frac{|z|}{2}}(z)} |z|^{-\frac{2(r-1)}{(r-2)}} = C_r|z|^{-\frac{2}{r-2}}. \tag{58}$$

Now the estimate (58) and Lemma 6.2 induce the required pointwise estimate. The derivative estimate comes from the scaling invariance of the A_{r-1}-spin equation, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the function $\varphi_\varepsilon(z) := \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{r-2}}\varphi(\varepsilon z)$ also satisfies the spin equation. □

By the pointwise estimate, we can get a uniform L^p-estimate:

Corollary 6.4. *Let $r \geq 3$ and $1 < p < 2(r-2)$. If φ is the solution of (53) in $B_2(0) - \{0\}$, then φ is an integrable function in $B_2(0)$, and furthermore*

$$||\varphi||_{p,B_2(0)} \leq C,$$

where C depends only on r, p.

We can also obtain the Harnack inequality for $|\varphi|$.

Lemma 6.5 (Harnack inequality). *Let $0 \leq \theta < 1$ be a fixed number, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Assume that φ is a solution of the equation (53) in $B_2(0) - \{0\}$, then*

$$\sup_{z \in T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)} |\varphi(z)| \leq C(r,\theta) \inf_{z \in T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)} |\varphi(z)|,$$

where $T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)$ is the annulus with radius between $\varepsilon(1-\theta)$ and ε, and $C(r,\theta)$ is a constant only depending on r and θ.

Proof. By equation (53), we have (since $\varphi \neq 0$)

$$(\log\varphi)_{\bar{z}} = -r\bar{\varphi}^{r-1}\varphi^{-1}.$$

Let

$$g(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{T(1-\theta,1)} \frac{-r\bar{\varphi}^{r-1}\varphi^{-1}(\zeta)dv}{\zeta - z},$$

then $g_{\bar{z}} = -r\bar{\varphi}^{r-1}\varphi^{-1}$, for $z \in T(1-\theta,1)$. Since $|\varphi(z)| \leq C_r(1-\theta)^{-\frac{1}{r-2}}$ for $z \in T(1-\theta,1)$, then $|-r\bar{\varphi}^{r-1}\varphi^{-1}|(z) \leq C_r(1-\theta)^{-1}$. Hence $|g(z)| \leq C(r,\theta)$, and g is a Hölder continuous function in $T(1-\theta,1)$. Let $\hat{\Psi} = \log\varphi - g$, then

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\bar{z}} = 0.$$

Since $\hat{\Psi}$ is continuous, $\hat{\Psi}$ is an analytic function. We have $\varphi = e^g e^{\hat{\Psi}}$. Let $\Psi = e^{\hat{\Psi}}$, then $\varphi = e^g\Psi$, where g is Hölder continuous and Ψ is analytic. The following estimate holds:

$$|\Psi(z)| \leq |e^{-g}\varphi(z)| \leq C(r,\theta) =: e^L. \tag{59}$$

Since g is bounded, to prove the Harnack inequality for φ, we need only prove the Harnack inequality for Ψ. Now $L - \log|\Psi(z)|$ is a nonnegative and harmonic function, so we have the gradient estimate:

$$|\nabla(L - \log|\Psi(z)|)| \leq C(r,\theta)(L - \log|\Psi(z)|) \leq C(r,\theta)L,$$

i.e., $|\nabla\log|\Psi(z)|| \leq C(r,\theta)$, which implies the Harnack inequality in $T(1-\theta,1)$,

$$\sup_{T(1-\theta,1)} |\Psi(z)| \leq C \inf_{T(1-\theta,1)} |\Psi(z)|. \tag{60}$$

To prove the Harnack inequality in the annulus $T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)$, we use the scaling invariance of Equation (53). Namely, if φ is the solution of (53) in $T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)$, then $\varphi_\varepsilon(z) := \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{r-2}}\varphi(\varepsilon z)$ is the solution of (53) in the annulus $T(1-\theta,1)$. Thus one can easily get the same conclusion in the annulus $T(\varepsilon(1-\theta),\varepsilon)$. □

Now by the maximum principle and the Harnack inequality, one can easily get a convergence corollary:

Corollary 6.6. *Let φ be a solution of the equation (53) in $B_2(0)-\{0\}$, then either $\varphi(z)$ is bounded near the origin or $\lim_{z\to 0}|\varphi(z)| = \infty$.*

The General W-case

Take ψ as the cut-off function as defined in the A_{r-1} case. Multiplying the two sides of Equation (46) by ψ^β for β sufficiently large, and doing integration by parts in $B := B_{\frac{|z|}{4}}(z)$, we have

$$\int_B W\beta\psi^\beta\partial_{\bar z}\psi = \sum_i\int_B\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2\psi^\beta, \tag{61}$$

or

$$\sum_i\int_B\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2\psi^\beta = \int\sum_i\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\varphi_i q_i\beta\psi^{\beta-1}\partial_{\bar z}\psi. \tag{62}$$

Let $\delta_i, i=1,\dots,t$ be the indices from Theorem 5.8, then we know that $\delta_i = q_i/\min_j\{1-q_j\}$. Define $\delta_0 = \max_i\{\delta_i\}$. Since we assume that $q_i = \mathrm{wt}(x_i) < 1/2$, we have $\delta_0 < 1$. By Theorem 5.8 and (62), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i\int_B|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}|^2\psi^\beta \leq & C\int_B\left(\sum_i\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|+1\right)^{1+\delta_0}\psi^{\beta-1}|\partial_{\bar z}\psi| \\
\leq & C\int_B\sum_i\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^{1+\delta_0}\psi^{\beta-1}|\partial_{\bar z}\psi| + \int_B|\partial_{\bar z}\psi| \\
\leq & \varepsilon\sum_i\int_B\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2\psi^\beta + C_\varepsilon\int\psi^{(\beta-\frac{1+\delta_0}{2}\beta-1)\frac{2}{1-\delta_0}}|\partial_{\bar z}\psi|^{\frac{2}{1-\delta_0}} + C.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\sum_i\int_B\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2\psi^\beta \leq C|z|^{-\frac{2\delta_0}{1-\delta_0}} + C. \tag{63}$$

So if $|z| < r_0$ for some r_0 depending only on W, we have for any $z\in B_{r_0}(0)$,

$$\sum_i\int_B\left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial\varphi_i}\right|^2\psi^\beta \leq C|z|^{-\frac{2\delta_0}{1-\delta_0}}. \tag{64}$$

By Theorem 5.8, Lemma 6.2 and the integral estimate (64), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_i q_i|\varphi_i|^2 \leq & \left(\frac{1}{|z|^2}\int_{B_{\frac{|z|}{4}}(z)} \sum_i |\varphi_i|^{\frac{2}{\delta_0}}\right)^{\delta_0} \\
\leq & C\left(\frac{1}{|z|^2}\int_B \sum_i \left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}\right|^2\right)^{\delta_0} \\
\leq & C|z|^{-\frac{2\delta_0}{1-\delta_0}}. \qquad (65)
\end{aligned}
$$

The above inequality implies the following theorem:

Theorem 6.7. *Suppose W to be a non-degenerate quasi-homogeneous polynomial with all the fractional degrees (or weights) $q_i < 1/2, i = 1, \ldots, t$. Let $u_i, i = 1, \ldots, t$ be the solutions of the W-spin equations in $B_1(0) - \{0\}$, then there exist constants r_0 and C only depending on W such that for any $z \in B_{r_0}(z)$ and all i,*

$$|u_i|(z) \leq C|z|^{-\kappa_i},$$

where $\kappa_i = \frac{q_i}{1-2q_i}$.

Proof. Since W is a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ it satisfies the equality

$$W(\lambda^{k_1}x_1, \ldots, \lambda^{k_t}x_t) = \lambda^d W(x_1, \ldots, x_t).$$

Hence $\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}$ is also a quasi-homogeneous polynomial satisfying

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}(\lambda^{k_1}x_1, \ldots, \lambda^{k_t}x_t) = \lambda^{d-k_i}\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_i}(x_1, \ldots, x_t). \qquad (66)$$

Assume that φ_i's are solutions of the equation (45), i.e.,

$$\bar{\partial}\varphi_i + \overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}} = 0, \forall i = 1, \ldots, t.$$

Set $\tilde{\varphi}_i := \lambda^{k_i}\varphi_i(\lambda^{d-2k_i}z)$, and then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{\partial}\tilde{\varphi}_i}{\partial \bar{z}} &= \lambda^{k_i}\frac{\bar{\partial}\varphi_i}{\partial \bar{z}}|_{\lambda^{d-2k_i}z}\lambda^{d-2k_i} \\
&= -\lambda^{d-k_i}\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}}(\varphi_1(\lambda^{d-2k_1}z), \ldots, \varphi_t(\lambda^{d-2k_t}z)) \\
&= -\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}}(\lambda^{k_1}\varphi_1(\lambda^{d-2k_1}z), \ldots, \lambda^{k_t}\varphi_t(\lambda^{d-2k_t}z)) \\
&= -\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial \varphi_i}}(\tilde{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\varphi}_t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, to derive the third equality, we used the relation (66). The above calculation shows that $\tilde{\varphi}_i$'s are also solutions of (45). Thus by the inequality (65), there exists a constant C only depending on W such that for $z \in B_{r_0}(0)$, there is

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i(\frac{r_0 z}{|z|}) \leq C.$$

Setting $\lambda^{d-2k_i} = |z|/r_0$ in the above inequality, we obtain

$$|\varphi_i| \leq C|z|^{-\kappa_i},$$

where $\kappa_i = \frac{q_i}{1-2q_i}$. Notice that $|u_i| = |u_i|_s = |\tilde{u}_i||z|^{-q_i} = |\varphi_i|$, and we are done. $\square$

Applying Theorem 6.7 to the A_{r-1} case, we can recover the first upper-bound estimate in Lemma 6.3, since in this case the fractional degree $q = 1/r$ and $\kappa = 1/(r-2)$. Similarly, only by calculating the fractional degrees and κ_i, we can obtain the following pointwise estimate of the D_{n+1}, E_6, E_7, E_8 cases.

Corollary 6.8. *If* (u_1, u_2) *are solutions of the* D_{n+1}*-spin equation*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial} u_1 + I_1(\overline{n u_1^{n-1} + u_2^2}) = 0 \\ \bar{\partial} u_2 + I_1(\overline{2 u_1 u_2}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

in $B_1(0) - \{0\}$ *for* $n \geq 3$, *then there exist constants* C *and* r_0 *depending only on* n *such that for* $z \in B_{r_0}(0)$, *there is*

$$|u_1| \leq C|z|^{-\frac{1}{n-2}}, |u_2| \leq C|z|^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

Proof. This is because the fractional degrees of the D_{n+1} polynomial are $(q_1, q_2) = (\frac{1}{n}, \frac{n-1}{2n})$ and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = (\frac{1}{n-2}, \frac{n-1}{2})$. $\square$

Since the E_6, E_8 cases are the same as the A_{r-1} case, we will only write down the corollary for the E_7 case.

Corollary 6.9. *If* (u_1, u_2) *are the solutions of the* E_7*-spin equation*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\partial} u_1 + I_1(\overline{3u_1^2 + u_2^3}) = 0 \\ \bar{\partial} u_2 + I_1(\overline{3u_1 u_2^2}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

in $B_1(0) - \{0\}$, *then there exist absolute constants* C *and* r_0 *such that for any* $z \in B_{r_0}(0)$, *there is*

$$|u_1| \leq C|z|^{-1}, |u_2| \leq C|z|^{-\frac{2}{5}}.$$

Proof. This is because the fractional degrees $(q_1, q_2) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{9})$ and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2) = (1, \frac{2}{5})$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Theorem 6.7, we have a uniform upper bound for the (regular or singular) solutions on $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon$. Then we can consider the following integral

$$\sum_i \left(\bar{\partial} u_i, I_1\left(\overline{\frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i}} \right) \right)_{L^2}$$

over Σ_ε minus some small discs around the Neveu-Schwarz points. This integral can be reduced to the sum of some curve integrals over the circles bounding the small discs and over $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon$. As in the proof of the previous section, the line integrals over the circles bounding the small discs will tend to zero as the radius tends to zero. Only the line integrals over $\partial\Sigma_\varepsilon$ contribute. But by Theorem 6.7, we have the uniform pointwise estimate for any solutions (singular or regular solutions). So we have

$$\left\| \frac{\partial W}{\partial u_i} \right\|_{2,\Sigma_\varepsilon}^2 \leq C_\varepsilon,$$

where C_ε only depends on ε. Now the same method used to prove inner compactness shows that weak compactness also holds. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. This follows from weak compactness and the fact that all the (regular or singular) solutions are uniformly integrable in a small neighborhood of the Ramond marked points as shown in Theorem 6.7. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank E. Witten for sharing many of his insights into the spin equations on which this paper is based. We thank Prof. Jürgen Jost and Prof. Xianqing Li-Jost at the Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics, Leipzig, for their great help. We also thank Prof. Weiyue Ding, Prof. Jiayu Li and Prof. Guofang Wang for many useful suggestions, and Prof. Ralph Kaufmann for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

[1] Abramovich, D. and Jarvis, T. Moduli space of twisted spin curves. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **131** (2003), no. 3, 685–699.

[2] Agmon, S. and Nirenberg, L. Properties of solutions of ordinary differential equations in Bananch space. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **16**(1963), 121–239.

[3] Agranovic, M. S. and Vishik, M. I. Elliptic boundary values problems dending on a paramete. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, **149**(1963), 223–226=*Soviet Math. Dokl.*,**4**(1963), 325–329

[4] Chen, W. and Ruan, Y. A new cohomology theory for orbifold. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **248** (2004), no. 1, 1–31.

[5] Chen, Y. and Wu, L. *Second order elliptic equations and elliptic systems.* Translated from the 1991 Chinese original by Bei Hu. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **174**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.

[6] Donaldson, S. K. *Floer homology groups in Yang-Mills theory*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **147**, Cambridge university press, 2002.

Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.

[7] Horn, R. and Johnson, C. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[8] Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E. and Polya, G. *Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, 1952.

[9] Jarvis, T. J. Geometry of the moduli of higher spin curves. *Inter. J. Math.* **11** (2000), 637–663.

[10] ———, Torsion-free sheaves and moduli of generalized spin curves. *Compositio Math.* **110** (1998), 291–333.

[11] Jarvis, T. J., Kimura, T. and Vaintrob, A. Moduli spaces of higher spin curves and integrable hierarchies. *Compositio Math.* **126** (2001), 157–212.

[12] Kaufmann, R. Singularities with symmetries, orbifold Frobenius algebras and mirror symmetry. *Gromov-Witten theory of spin curves and orbifolds (San Francisco, 2003)*, 67–116, Contemp. Math., 403. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

[13] ———, Personal communication, 2003

[14] Konstevich, M. Intersection theory on the moduli space of curves and the matrix Airy function. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **164** (1992), 1–23.

[15] Lockhart, R. Fredholm Properties of a Class of ellipitic operators on non-compact manifolds, *Duke Math.*, **48** (1981), no. 1, 289–312

[16] Lockhart, R. and Mcowen, R. Elliptic differential operators on nomcompact manifolds, *Ann. Sci. Norm. Sup. Pisa* **12**(1985), 409–447

[17] Lockhart, R. Fredholm, Hodge and Liouville theorems on noncompact matnifolds, *Tran. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **301** (1987), no. 1, 1–35

[18] Mumford, D. Towards an enumerative geometry of the moduli space of curves, *Arithmetic and Geometry, Part II. (Switzerland, 1983)*, 271–328. Progress in Math., 36. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.

[19] Polishchuk, A. Witten's top Chern class on the moduli space of higher spin curves, *Frobenius manifolds, (Wiesbaden, 2002)* , 253–264. Aspects Math., E36, Vieweg, Wiesbaden, 2004.

[20] Satake, I. The Gauss-Bonnet theorem for V-manifolds, *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **9** (1957), no. 4, 464–491.

[21] Seeley, R. and Singer, I. M. Extending $\bar{\partial}$ to singular Riemann surfaces. *J. Geom. Phys.* **5** (1989), 121–136.

[22] Thurston, W. P. *Three dimensional geometry and Topology*, Princeton mathematical ser., 35. Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

[23] Witten, E. Two-dimensional gravity and intersection theory on the moduli space. *Surveys in Diff. Geom. (Cambridge, MA, 1990)*, 243–310. Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, PA, 1991.

[24] ———, Algebraic geometry associated with matrix models of two-dimensional gravity. *Topological methods in modern mathematics (Stony Brook, NY, 1991)*, 235–269, Publish or Perish, Houston, TX, 1993.
[25] ———, Personal Communication, 2003.

PEKING UNIVERSITY AND MAX-PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, LEIPZIG

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON